Acton. b. 8. 34.

SEVERAL

TREATISES,

Written upon Several OCCASIONS;

By the Right Reverend Father in God

GEORGE

Lord Bishop of *WINTON*,

Both before and since the KING's Restauration:

WHEREIN

His Judgment is fully made known concerning the Church of *ROME* and most of those Doctrines, which are controverted betwixt Her and the Church of *ENGLAND*.



UNIVERSITY OF CAMBRIDGE

LONDON, Printed for *Joanna Brome*, 1683.

Sec. 1725:02



THE ORDER Of the TREATISES.



A *Preface.*

The ſumme of a ſhort Conference with a Jeſuite at Bruxells.

An Argument drawn from the Evidence and Certainty of Senſe againſt Tranſubſtantiation.

A Vindication of the Argument drawn from Senſe againſt Tranſubſtantiation.

A Letter from Father Creſſey *with the Biſhop's Anſwer to it.*

A Sermon preached before the King at White-hall, Nov. 5. 1667.

* *Three Letters; The Firſt written by a* Roman *Prieſt to the Biſhop of* Winton. *The Second written by the ſame Prieſt to the Biſhop of* Ferns *in* Ireland. *The Third the Biſhop of* Winton's *Letter in anſwer to the ſaid Prieſt.*

The Order of the Treatiſes.

A Letter written by the Biſhop of Wincheſter *to the Dutcheſs of* York *ſome few Months befcre her Death.*

Ad Cl. Virum *Janum Vlitium* Epiſtolæ duæ; de Invocatione Sanctorum.

Epiſtola ad Virum Cl. D. *Cornelium Triglandium*, de Sereniſſimi Regis animo erga Religionem.

A Poſtſcript.

THE

THE PREFACE.

HOW little forward I have been to trouble the Preſs, or the Publick with any ſcribling of mine, needs no other proof, but that I was paſt my great Climacterical, before any thing of mine was publiſhed with mine own privity and conſent: and then indeed the Sermon I Preached at the KING'S Coronation, was by His Majeſties command Printed; and a little while after a Letter of mine, written to Vindicate my ſelf from ſome ſcandalous aſperſions caſt upon me in Print by Mr. Baxter, was Printed alſo. Which Letter of mine Mr. Baxter having taken no notice of for near twenty years after, I thought it would have been the laſt trouble of that kind, that ever I ſhould be put unto; eſpecially, after I was above fourſcore years of age, and had left off the having any thing to do in the World, but to prepare for my going quietly, and comfortably out of it. But ô fallacem ſpem meam! For I was no ſooner got into the Harbour where I might, and thought (for the little time of my life that was left) to reſt ſecurely; but Mr. Baxter hales me forth again, by an Addreſs made to the Biſhop of Ely, and Me, before his Book, called The only true way to Concord. In which Addreſs of his, though therewere ſome things untruly ſaid to my reproach, yet I did not think them tanti (and ſome of my very good Friends were of the ſame Opinion) as that I ſhould, for the refuting of them, engage my ſelf into a new Quarrel; whereof in all probability I might not live long enough to ſee an end.

And truly upon this and other conſiderations, I was more than half reſolved to take no more notice of what he had ſaid to me and

of me in that Addreſs *of his, than for ought I knew, he never until then had taken of what I had ſaid of him, in that aforeſaid* Letter *of mine. And in this ſuſpenſion of mind I continued, until he ſent me a* Book, *containing ſeveral Treatiſes, and one of them (as he ſaith himſelf in his* Preface *to that Book)* Written purpoſely to confute Biſhop *Morley's* groſs miſtaking Charge againſt Him. *Then indeed I began to think my ſelf concerned to re-examine what I had ſaid of Him in that aforeſaid* Letter *of mine, or in my* Cenſure *of thoſe* Aphoriſms *of his, annexed to, and Printed with that* Letter; *as likewiſe what he hath ſaid of me, or againſt me, for the juſtifying of himſelf, and to give the World an account of both, to judge, as they ſhall ſee cauſe, betwixt us.*

But whilſt I was doing, and had almoſt done as much as I thought neceſſary in order to this end; out comes a Book of a French Jeſuite, *named* Maimbourgh, *wherein he reciteth ſomething, which he ſaith was written by the late* Ducheſs of York, *to juſtifie her leaving the Communion of the* Church of England, *to embrace that of* Rome. *In which reſolution (as he tells us) ſhe ſaith ſhe was confirmed by a* Conference *ſhe had* with two of the moſt learned Biſhops of England; *to whom having propoſed her ſcruples, particularly* concerning the Real Preſence of our Lord in the Sacrament, the Infallibility of the Church, Confeſſion, and Prayers for the Dead, ſhe received ſuch anſwers as were a means to increaſe the deſire ſhe had to the Roman Catholick Religion. *And truly if the* Anſwers *were ſuch (as the Paper pretended to be written by the* Ducheſs, *and quoted by the* Jeſuite *ſaith they were) how* learned *ſoever thoſe* Biſhops *were (if there were any ſuch* Biſhops *that made any ſuch* Anſwers) *they were not* Biſhops *of the* Church of England *truly ſo called, eſpecially he of the two, that ſo frankly told the Ducheſs,* That if he had been bred up in the Catholick Religion he ſhould not have left it; *thereby acknowledging that he was not bred up in the* Catholick Religion, *and conſequently that the Religion of the Church of* England *is not the* Catholick *Religion, or that the only* Catholick Religion *is that of* Rome; *than which, there could not be a more forcible reaſon to perſuade the* Ducheſs

to

to go thither: becauſe We all confeſs there is no Salvation to be had, but in the Catholick Religion; *and then He himſelf was obliged as well as the* Ducheſs *to quit our Religion, and embrace theirs, what ſcandal ſoever he might have given to others by ſo doing. But if by* Catholick; *he meant the* Roman Catholick, *or the* Catholick Religion, *as it is profeſſed in the* Church of Rome, *and that if he had been bred up in that Religion,* he ſhould not (*meaning by* ſhould not *he would not, or ought not*) *to have left it, knowing both Religions as well as he now did; I think he was not either ſo* learned, *or ſo* conſcientious, *as he ought to have been, nor ſo* prudent *neither in ſaying ſo much, and no more, (if he did ſay no more) to one in her condition: I mean to one that doubted, whether it was ſafe for her to continue in our Church or no. For although it ſhould be true (as it ſeems that he thought it was) that* Salvation *was equally to be had in* both Churches, *which is to condemn the* Church of England *of* Schiſm *for having ſeparated from the* Church of Rome; *and therefore whoſoever he is that doth think ſo, he is not to be accounted a* Son, *and much leſs a* Father *or* Biſhop *of our Church: but ſuppoſing (I ſay) he thought that* Salvation *was equally to be had in* both Churches, *or as probably to be had in the* one, *as in the* other, *and conſequently in* ours, *as well as* theirs; *Why did he not perſuade the* Ducheſs *to do as he did, namely to continue in our Church, wherein ſhe had been Baptized, as well as he was, and by departing from which, ſhe ſhould give as great, and perhaps a greater* Scandal, *than He by his departure from it could do; beſides the drawing of many* Inconveniences *upon her ſelf and perhaps upon the whole Nation (which ſhe might, and was obliged in* prudence *to avoid, yea and in* conſcience *too) why did he not perſuade her I ſay, to ſtay where ſhe was, as he did, if all things neceſſary to ſalvation were to be had* here, *as well as* there *he ſaid they were? And therefore ſuppoſing there was ſome ſuch* Biſhop (*as I can not believe there was*) *that ſaid, what that* Jeſuite *tells us that* Biſhop *ſaid to the* Ducheſs; *yet I cannot ſee how that ſhould encreaſe her deſire of going out of our Church to the Sea of* Rome. *For either ſhe did, or did not believe what he ſaid to be true: If ſhe did not, then what he ſaid could have*

no operation upon her one way or other. But if she did believe what he said, (namely, that all things necessary to Salvation were to be had in our Church.) *she was, as I said before, obliged in* Conscience, *as well as* Prudence *to continue in it, to prevent the* scandal *she might give, and the* Inconveniency *she might bring upon her self, and probably upon the whole Nation, by going out of it; And that the* Bishop *did believe what he said to be true in this particular (viz.)* That all things necessary to Salvation were to be had in the Church of England, *the* Dutchess *(if she had thought him a man of any Conscience at all) could not choose but believe also, because by staying in it himself, he laid his own Soul to pawn, for the truth of it. And therefore, one would think, that his telling her that he did and would continue in our Church, with the reasons he gave for it, should have dissuaded Her* Highness *from having any farther thought of going out of it.*

But why should I say any more, or indeed so much as I have said of a Non-Ens, *or of what I believe never was in* Rerum naturâ; *I mean such a discourse, as is pretended to have been betwixt the Dutchess of* York, *and two of the most learned Bishops of* England? *I know no proof we have, that there was ever any such thing, at least in Print, or publickly known, and avowed, but this attestation of* Maimbourgh *the Jesuite, who I am sure, was neither Eye nor Ear Witness of it, but must have it by hearsay only, from others, and from others, who had it from others, that might be the devisers of it.*

But supposing there was such a thing; supposing there was such a Conference *betwixt her* Highness, *and two* Bishops *of the Church of* England; *and that what they said to her did increase her desire to embrace the* Roman Catholick Religion: *yet what doth that concern you (may some man say) as to your own particular? Are you one of the* two of the most learned Bishops of the Church of England? *(for so it is said they were, to whom the* Dutchess *propos'd her scruples) No; I am not, I know I am not, I am sure I am not; but yet (how unlearned, and how unworthy soever) I am a* Bishop, *and a* Bishop of the Church of England: *and therefore as he, to whom it was said,* Tantumne

otii.

otii tibi à re tuâ eſt, aliena ut cures? *anſwered,* Homo ſum, Humani nihil à me alienum puto; *ſo ſay I,* Epiſcopus ſum, & Epiſcopus Eccleſiæ Anglicanæ, *and therefore think my ſelf concerned in whatſoever was ſaid in reproach of* Epiſcopacy; *eſpecially in reproach of any of the* Biſhops *of our own Church. And what can be more reproachfully ſpoken, or more ſcandalouſly publiſhed of our* Biſhops, *than that* two of the moſt learned *of them did encourage any, eſpecially ſuch a Perſon as the Ducheſs of* York, *by the anſwers they gave unto her ſcruples to quit that* Church, *which ſhe and themſelves were of, and which they meant to continue in? What (I ſay) can be ſaid more to the reproach of* Epiſcopacy *in the Church of* England? *eſpecially, when what is ſaid but of* two, *without naming of them, may be applyed to any two, and conſequently in effect to all of them; and in reaſon rather to thoſe that are the leaſt, than to thoſe that are the moſt learned of them; eſpecially, if any of thoſe, that are the leſs learned, have had a nearer relation, than any of the more learned, to her* Highneſs: *And of* theſe *I confeſs my ſelf to have been one, and the chief; I mean one of the leſs learned, and chief of thoſe of my* Order *and* Profeſſion, *that had relation to her* Highneſs; *having long before, ſhe was exalted to that highth of dignity and greatneſs, bred her up from her very Child-hood almoſt (whilſt we were abroad) in the Fundamentals of the* Chriſtian Doctrine *and* Religion, *as it is profeſſed, and by Law Eſtabliſhed, in the* Church of England.

For though we were then in Antwerp, *where no Religion, but that of* Rome, *is either profeſſed, or tolerated; yet there I read the* Divine Service *of our Church twice a day at the* Canonical *hours; and celebrated the Sacrament of the* Euchariſt *once a month, admitting thereunto, as likewiſe to our daily Prayers, as many of our* Proteſtant *Countrymen, as were willing to communicate with us; as Sir* John Shaw *and his Family, and ſometimes the Duke of* New-Caſtle *and his Family did alſo, beſides divers others. I did there likewiſe* Bury the Dead, *and* Baptize Children *according to the form preſcribed in our* Liturgy, *as often as I was deſired to do ſo, which was indeed but ſeldom, and when I did it, it was privately in the Houſe, where the Child to be baptiz'd*

was

was born, and where the Party died that was to be buried. And thus I buried Mr. Mungo Murrey, *a Gentleman of Quality, and One of the* Kings *Servants, reading the* Office of Burial *prescribed by our Church, and using all the Formalities required by that Office; the Earl of* Dysart, *a Countryman and Kinsman of the deceased, assisting amongst others at the Solemnity. After which being done in the House wherein he died, the Body was at Midnight conveyed to a poor Cloyster, and there Interr'd, as the Bodies of other* Protestants *that died there were also; which was a favour easily and usually obtained for a little Money. But besides this, I did, once a Week at least,* Catechise *the whole Family wherein I lived, which was that of Sir* Edward Hyde, *then* Chancellor of the Exchequer, *and* Ambassador in Spain, *Father to the* Dutchess, *whom together with her three* Brethren (*of whom the two eldest are yet living, and who* can (*I doubt not but* will) *attest what I say to be true*) *I did especially indeavour to instruct in the* Principles of Christian Doctrine and Practice, *as they are taught in our* Church Catechism, *to the end that being well grounded in the fundamentals of the* Protestant Religion, *as it is taught and professed in our Church, they might not easily be seduced, either to* Popery, *or to any other* Heresie *whilest they were abroad; or to* Presbytery, *or to any other* Schismatical Sect, *when they came home. The* Dutchess, *as she was the eldest, so was she the forwardest, and most capable to receive Instruction; for God having given her an extraordinary good* Understanding, *for one of her Sex and Years, so he had given her an extraordinary good* Inclination *likewise to the exercises of Piety and Devotion: so that when she was not (as I remember) above twelve years of Age, I did think her to be every way fit to be admitted to the receiving the Holy Sacrament of the* Lords Supper; *which she did then, and always afterwards, with very great Devotion, as long as she and I stay'd together in her Fathers House at* Antwerp, *which I think was about three or four years; from whence as she went to wait upon the* Princess Royal *at the* Hague; *so did I to wait upon the* Queen of Bohemia.

The reason of my going thither, was this; That Good Queen *having been long a desolate Widow, driven out not only of* Bohemia,

mia, *her Husbands Kingdom by Election, but out of the* Palatinate *alſo, his Patrimonial Inheritance, and having lived long an Exile in* Holland, *but without any Charge to the* States, *and yet plentifully, at leaſt ſufficiently to ſupport her and her Family by the Penſions left her by King* James *her Father, and as I think increaſed and well pay'd her by King* Charles *her Brother, was, after his death, reduced to extream neceſſity; all her Penſions from* England *being withdrawn from her, ſo that ſhe had not ſo much as wherewithall to* entertain *a* Chaplain, *as ſhe had done formerly; and as according to her generous, and truly Royal and Gracious diſpoſition, ſhe had a mind to do, and being then without any Chaplain at all, I offered her my ſervice, if ſhe pleaſed to accept of it, without expecting any Salary at all for it. For though I brought but* 130l. *(which was all that I was then worth) out of* England *along with me; yet ſuch was the Kindneſs of my Friends in* England *to Me, whilſt I was abroad, that although I ſpent, and lent, and gave away yearly as much, and ſometimes more than I brought at firſt with me; I did after betwixt* 11 *or* 12 *years being abroad, bring home more than I carried out, without putting the* King *my Maſter, or the* Queen of Bohemia *my Miſtreſs to any charge, but that of Dyet in her Houſe, for my ſelf and one ſervant only. The* Queen *willingly accepted my offer, and I went to her, and was very graciouſly received and uſed by her all the time I was with her, which was two years and an half; during which time I read the* Service *of our* Church *daily to her and her Family, and* Catechis'd *ſuch of her Servants of both Sexes, as would come unto me. I* Preached *likewiſe ſometimes to her* Majeſty *at the* Engliſh Church *in the* Hague, *and ſometimes to her* Majeſty *and* Princeſs Royal *at the* French Church *there alſo; but never had any thing to do with the* Claſſis, *nor they with me, either there, or any where elſe, all the while I was in the* Presbyterian; *nor ever was ſo much as once preſent at a* Maſs, *nor kneeled at the Expoſition or meeting of the* Hoſt, *whilſt I was in the* Popiſh *Countries; though I was many times threatned to be complain'd of, to the Biſhop of* Antwerp, *by the* Engliſh Papiſts *that were there, and eſpecially by thoſe that were* Apoſtates *from our Church; but I believe my living in Sir* Ed-

ward

ward Hyde's *House*, *who was there* (*as I said before*) Ambassador in Spain, *was my Protection.*

And thus I have given a short and summary Account *of my self, and what I did whilst I was abroad: Whereunto might be added, that when I was in* France, *I did at* Paris *assist Doctor* Cozins, *late Bishop of* Durham, *in preaching to the* English Protestants *there at Sir* Richard Brown's *House, then* Resident *there for our* King, *but never went to the* French Presbyterian Church *at* Charenton, *no more than I did afterwards to that of* Caen *in* Normandy, *whilst I was there. For which being asked the reason of the chief Pastor of the Church, the learned* Monsieur Bouchart, *my answer was, that I forbore to come to their Church*; First, *Because we had, at my Lady* Ormonds *House there, a Congregation of our own, wherein we had not only* Preaching, *as they had, but a* Liturgy, *or solemn Form of Worshiping God by* Prayers, Praises, *and* Thanksgivings, *which* (*as I was inform'd*) *they had not in their Churches.* Secondly, *Because though I understood their Language when I read it, yet I did not understand it, when I heard it spoken, so well, as though the matter were never so good, to be at all edified by it. And,* Thirdly, *Because if they did not favour and encourage, yet they did not, at least they had not hitherto, condemned or reproved the scandalous and rebellious proceedings of their* Presbyterian *Brethren in* England, *against the* King, *and against the* Church; *which until they should do by some publick Act, or manifestation of their Judgment to the contrary, I could not chuse but think they approved, or at least did not dislike what our* Presbyterians *in* England *had done, and were still adoing. And therefore I did forbear for the present, to joyn in Communion with them there at* Caen, *as I had done formerly, for the very same reasons, with those at* Charenton.

And they were these reasons of mine which I sent Monsieur Bouchart *in a* Letter, *written in* Latin, *which drew from that learned man the* Answer *which he afterward printed, and wherein he justifies the* Episcopal *Government in* England, *and condemns the taking up of Arms by* Subjects *against their* Sovereigns *in defence of* Religion, *or for any other cause, or upon any other pretence whatsoever.*

From

From France *I came back again with the* King *to the Treaty of* Breda, *and did there Preach the laſt Sermon he heard before he went into* Scotland, *whither neither I, nor any of his Chaplains, were ſuffered to go with Him. How he was uſed there, and his unſucceſsful expedition into* England; *and how by the extraordinary and almoſt miraculous Providence of God, he made his Eſcape from thence and returned into* France, *I leave to Him that writes the* Hiſtory *of theſe times to relate.*

From France (*where one would have thought the Grand-Child of* Henry *the Great and Couſin German to the* King *in being might have been permitted to have ſtayed longer*) *he went into* Germany, *and fixed at* Colen, *whither I* (*being then in the ſervice of the Queen of* Bohemia) *went to Him and Preached two Sermons before him; of which he did me the honour to require the Copies, which having written out for him, I returned to the* Hague *and to my attendance on the* Queen of Bohemia; *where I continued until the* King *came into the* King of Spains *Dominions; and then after two years and an half ſervice* (*as I ſaid before*) *I took my leave of the* Queen of Bohemia, *that I might be more at liberty to wait upon the* King, *as there ſhould be occaſion for it, leaving Doctor* Beaumont (*now one of the Prebends of* Wincheſter) *to ſupply my place at the* Hague, *from whence I went firſt to* Breda, *where I writ that Letter to* Ulitius *againſt* Invocation of Saints. *From* Breda *I went to* Bruxells *in* Brabrant, *where our* King *then was, and afterwards to* Bruges *in* Flanders, *when the* King *removed from* Bruxells *thither, Preaching before him at both places; but once indeed at the former, but ſeveral times at the latter, where he ſtayed longer, and there being none of his Chaplains but Doctor* Earls (*afterwards Biſhop of* Salisbury) *there then with Him.*

At Bruges *I writ the* Argument drawn from the Evidence of ſenſe againſt Tranſubſtantiation, *for the ſatisfaction of Mr.* James Hamilton, *Nephew to the Duke of* Ormond; *who thereupon left the* Church of Rome, *and lived and died a* Proteſtant *of the* Church of England. *And a little while after upon the coming out of a* Pamphlet, *taking notice of that* Argument, *and ſlighting of it, I writ that other Paper in* Vindication *of it.*

The Letter *to* Triglandius, *the Prince of* Orange's *Tutor, I writ from* Antwerp; *the Occaſion of it was a falſe and malicious Report of our* King's *being a* Papiſt; *which Report had its birth and growth from the Kings own Schiſmatical and Rebellious Subjects, living in* Holland, *and in others of the* States *Dominions; who being themſelves diſaffected to the* King, *and his cauſe, did do what they could to make the People of thoſe Provinces, where they lived, as ill affected to the* King *and his cauſe, as they were themſelves. What operation this* Letter *had upon the People of thoſe Countries, I know not, but it was Printed at the* Hague *without my privity, and without my name to it; But this I know, that ſeveral of the moſt learned of their Divines, whom I converſed with, did not only confeſs our Church Government in* England *by Biſhops to be lawful, but the moſt antient and moſt uſeful for the keeping out of* Hereſies *and* Schiſms; *and wiſht they were ſo happy as to have it reſtored and eſtabliſhed again in their Churches: for as one of them told me they were weary of their* Lay-Elders, *which he acknowledged to be a Novelty, unknown and unheard of in the Primitive times.*

Some of them likewiſe ſeemed to be very much diſſatisfied, that Children *being in evident and imminent danger of death, and therefore could not be brought to the Church, were not by their Diſcipline to be* Baptiz'd *at home, and conſequently died without Baptiſm; as likewiſe thoſe very* aged *and* ſick Perſons, *who could not come to Church, though they were never ſo long* Clinici, *or Bed-rid, could not have the Sacrament of the* Lords Supper *given them at home, though they did never ſo earneſtly deſire it, or long for it, or never ſo much hunger and thirſt after it: there being no Miniſter, ſubject to the* Claſſis, *whether Native, or Foreigner, that durſt adminiſter either of the* Sacraments, *in either of the aforeſaid Caſes. Inſomuch that one of their Miniſters, having an Infant of his own very near death, and deſiring it ſhould be Baptized before it died, deſired me to do it for him; not daring to do it himſelf, nor able to get any other* Claſſical *Miniſter to do it for him. I did it; as likewiſe at the ſame Miniſters requeſt, I did give the other* Sacrament, *the Sacrament of the bleſſed Body and Blood of our Lord and Saviour* Chriſt Jeſus, *to a* Dutch *Lieutenant Collonel,*

nel, who had been a Page to our King James, *and therefore understood and spake our language. This Gentleman had lain long bedrid of the Gout, and being then drawing towards his end did* desiderio desiderare, *vehemently desire to have the holy* Viaticum *administred unto him to strengthen and comfort him in his last Agony; which though by the sixth Canon of the* Nicene Council, *it is not be denied even to an excommunicated Person, if he desire it when he is a dying, yet it was denied, or which is all one, it was not by the order of their* Ecclesiastical *Government to be administred to to this poor Gentleman, not because he was excommunicated, or would not, but because he could not come to Church: as if the* Cup of blessing, *which we bless, were not the* κοινωνία *or communicating of the Blood of* Christ, *and the* Bread which we break, *were not the communicating of the Body of* Christ, *in what place soever they are Sacramentally blessed, and solemnly given by a* lawful Minister, *and faithfully received by a* Penitent Communicant; *or, as if the Assembly together of some few Persons, in such a Case, and to such an End, were not an* Ἐκκλησία, *or such an Assembly, as may be called a* Church *or* Congregation, *wherein Christ hath promis'd to be present, though it be but in a private place, when it cannot be had in the publick place of Gods worship; or lastly, As if because the* Sacraments *are* Seals *annexed unto the* Word, *therefore they ought not to be administred upon any occasion, but in a* Church, *and after the Preaching of a* Sermon *too, (for if a Child were brought to Church to be Baptiz'd there, and were so near death, as in all probability it could not live so long as till the* Sermon *was ended, it must die without* Baptism) *as if the* Sacraments *could not be annexed as* Seals *unto the* Word *without a* Sermon: *Whereas it is the annexion of the* Word *unto the* Elements *in the administration of it, that makes it be a* Sacrament; *no other Words, but that which is pronounced by a Priest in the administration of it, being essential to it; for as it is the Priests sprinkling the Child with Water, and saying* I baptize thee in the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, *is all which is essential or absolutely necessary to* Baptism, *or to make the Child so Baptiz'd, partaker of the inward spiritual Grace, signified and exhibited by the Sacrament: so is it the Priests giving of the Bread,*

and saying, This is the Body of Christ which was given for you; Take and eat this in remembrance that Christ died for you, *together with the Priests giving of the Wine, and saying*, This is Christs Blood which was shed for you; Drink this in remembrance that Christs Blood was shed for you, *is all which is necessary to make the Penitent and faithful Receivers of both, to be Partakers of the inward and spiritual Grace, signified, and exhibited and sealed unto them by that Sacrament also. So that no other Words but the Sacramental Words themselves, which make them to be* Sacraments, *are absolutely and essentially necessary to make them efficacious, and effectual, in order to those Ends for which they were Instituted and Ordained. And therefore in case of a necessity when the* Child *could not be carried to* Church *without danger of dying by the Way, or of dying in the Church before it could be baptiz'd, I baptiz'd it at home according to the order and usage of our Church being no subject unto theirs. So did I give the* Communion *also to the aforesaid Lieutenant Collonel, who could not have it from any of their Ministers, without going to Church, and could not by reason of his Weakness and Sickness go to Church to receive it: which I did according to the Order and usage of our Church also. And this I did whilst I was in* Holland, *and in the* Queen of Bohemias *service; which having forgot to speak of before in its due place, I do now rehearse, to show that as I did not comply with any of the* Popish *Idolatries and Superstitions, when I lived among the* Papists; *so I did not submit my self to the* Classis, *or comply with any of their novel Usages and Practises, contrary to those of our own and the Primitive Church, whilst I lived among the* Presbyterians; *and consequently did neither behave my self as a* Romanist *in the one place, or as a rigid* Calvinist *in the other; though there be one that saith it, and saith it in Print, (and I presume will stand by it, because he owns himself to be the Author of it by setting his name to it)* that I disguise my being a Papist in my heart, by seeming a rigid Calvinist by profession.

Vid. *Elymas* the Sorcerer, *p.* 28. *l.* ult.

But perhaps it may be said by that Libeller *and others (who out of their good Will to me would have him to be believed) that though I was not a disguised* Papist *under the Cloak of a* Rigid Calvinist

Calviniſt *whilſt I was abroad, yet I might be ſo after I came home, and was therefore placed about the* Ducheſs *to pervert her in her Religion: and ſo was moſt likely to be one of thoſe* two Biſhops, *which* Maimbourgh *tells us the* Ducheſs *ſaid ſhe did communicate her ſcruples unto, and by whoſe anſwers to them ſhe was incouraged to change her Religion. And that I was one of them indeed, it is the whole ſcope of the aforeſaid Libellers Pamphlet (called* Elymas the Sorcerer) *to make the World believe.* Elymas, p. 33.

Now that I was choſen by the Ducheſs (*as ſoon as ſhe was owned to be ſo*) *to be her Spiritual Director and* Guide, *in thoſe things that concerned her Spiritual and Everlaſting condition, is very true; and the reaſon, why ſhe made choice of me to be ſo, rather than any other of my Order, was, becauſe ſhe knew me better, and becauſe I had been her firſt Inſtructor in matters of Religion many years before. In this relation of mine to the* Ducheſs *I continued, until after her Fathers Baniſhment, and all that time I muſt bear her Witneſs, that ſhe was not only a zealous* Proteſtant *her ſelf, according as it is by Law Eſtabliſhed in the* Church of England, *but zealous to make* Proteſtants, *as appears by what ſhe did for that counterfeit pretended Convert* Macedo (*whom the aforeſaid* Libeller *magnifies ſo much. though he knows he proved himſelf to be an arrant* Impoſtor *and profligated Wretch*) *and in her own deportment, as devout and charitable, as ever I knew any of her Age and Sex: Inſomuch as that beſides her* private Prayers *Morning and Evening which ſhe never omitted; ſhe dayly and duly obſerved the* Canonical hours *of the* Publick Service *of God in her* Chappel *with thoſe of her Family. Neither did ſhe ever (as long as I was with her) omit the receiving of the Sacrament of the* Lords Supper *once every month at leaſt, beſides that of ſolemn* Feſtivals *when ſhe always received with the* King *in the* Chappel Royal, *and always the day before ſhe received ſhe made a voluntary* Confeſſion *of what ſhe thought ſhe had offended God in, either by Omiſſion or by Commiſſion, profeſſing her ſorrow for it, and promiſing amendment of it, and then kneeling down ſhe deſired and received* Abſolution, *in the Form and Words preſcribed by our Church. This for her* Devotion. *And as for* Charity, *ſhe did every time ſhe received the* Sacrament, *beſides*

five

five pounds in Gold ſhe gave at the Altar, ſhe gave me twenty pounds to give to ſuch as I thought had moſt need of it, and did beſt deſerve it. This was her ordinary and conſtant Way of expreſſing her Charity. *But that which ſhe did at other times, and upon extraordinary occaſions I believe was very much more, eſpecially in the time of the great* Plague. *To conclude, I remember ſhe told the late Arch-Biſhop of* Canterbury *and me, when we were both together with her, that if ſhe did not as much in point of* Charity *as was fit for her to do, it ſhould be his fault and mine, and not hers.*

I continued my attendance on her Highneſs *until after her Fathers Baniſhment, and mine own diſmiſſion from mine own Imployment in the* Court, *which was in the year* 67. *and then thinking it decent and neceſſary for me to retire into the Country, I did with her conſent and good liking ſubſtitute Dr.* Blandford (*the then Biſhop of* Oxford, *and afterwards Biſhop of* Worceſter) *to wait upon her in my ſtead. And I made choice of him rather than any other, not only becauſe in regard of his Learning, Piety, Gravity and Modeſty, together with the Gentleneſs and Sweetneſs of his Addreſs and Converſation, he was at leaſt as fit as any other I could think of for that Imployment; but alſo becauſe in regard of his former relation of* Chaplain *to her* Father (*to whom he owed his Preferment in the Church*) *he was much fitter, and much more likely to be acceptable to her* Highneſs (*as indeed upon that very account he was*) *than any other* (*though every way elſe equal to him,*) *could have been. So that I thought I left her in better hands than mine own, and I am ſure I left her without any the leaſt Inclination to* Popery, *or any the leaſt ſcruple againſt any thing taught or profeſſed in the* Church of England. *Neither did I hear any thing to the contrary until about two years after coming up to attend in* Parliament *I was very much ſurprized and allarum'd, when I heard ſhe was talked of in Coffee-Houſes, as if ſhe had forſaken, or was forſaking the* Church of England, *and going to the* Church of Rome. *And when upon a ſtricter enquiry, I was told ſhe had forborn ſeveral monthly* Communions, *which ſhe never had done ſo much as once before. Whereupon I applyed*

applyed my self to her and dealt with Her, as it is related in the Letter I sent to her, by one of her Brothers, the Copy whereof I sent to her Father in Normandy, and have now Printed, which I never thought to have done, and indeed never would have done, but that I was perſuaded by my Friends to do ſo, as a thing abſolutely neceſſary for mine own Vindicaton from being one of thoſe two Biſhops, the Jeſuite Maimbourgh ſpeaks of; and ſuch an Evidence as of it ſelf alone was ſuffiicient to prove (that what the Author of Elymas the Sorcerer hath ſaid to make the World believe that I perverted the Ducheſs,) and in order thereunto, as likewiſe to the perverting the Duke alſo, I had cauſed him to be put out of the Dukes ſervice) is nothing elſe but meer Malice and Forgery. But for this I ſhall call him to another kind of account hereafter, if I live, and he do not run away before.

There be other Papers beſides that Letter to the Ducheſs which I writ ſince my return to England; the one a very little while after my coming home; and is an Anſwer to a Letter (written by Father Creſly a Benedictine Monk, and an Apoſtate from our Church, to Mr. John Markam) wherein I and many others of our perſecuted Orthodox Clergy are concerned. The other is a Letter to a Franciſcan Fryar, to convince him, that by what he hath ſaid himſelf in a Letter to a Popiſh Prelate as well by way of Apology for the Engliſh Church in general, as for Dr. Sall in particular, for his leaving the Church of Rome to come to Ours, he is obliged in Conſcience to become a member of our Church alſo, and to declare himſelf to be ſo. Which Letters of the Franciſcan Fryar to me and to the Romiſh Biſhop, and mine to him in anſwer to them were written ſince the death of the Ducheſs of York; and I have cauſed them to be printed as well as thoſe before her death, and whilſt I was abroad, to ſhew that I was always and in all places no other than the very ſame; and no other either in Judgment or Profeſſion than what I am now and will by Gods grace always continue, whatſoever changes there may be, or whatſoever hazards I may run: I mean, a true Son of the Church of England as it is Eſtabliſhed by Law; a loyal faithful and obedient Subject to the King, a hater of Schiſm in the Church and Faction in the State;

State; *and ſo zealous for the preſerving the Antient and fundamental conſtitution of the* Government *in this Kingdom, that as I never did, ſo I never will give my conſent for the excluding the next in blood, or the lawful and rightful* Heir of the Crown *upon any pretence whatſoever.*

Ita teſtor *Geor. Winton*,
An. Dom. 1682. & ætatis
meæ 84. menſe 9.

A

LETTER

FROM

Father Cressey,

A

Benedictine Monk,

TO

An English Gentleman,

WHEREIN

Bishop *MORLEY* is Concerned:

WITH

The Bishops ANSWER to it.

LONDON:

Printed for *Joanna Brome.* 1683.

A LETTER FROM Father Cressey TO Mr. *MARKHAM*, WHEREIN Bishop *Morley* is Concerned.

UNIVERSITY LIBRARY ACQUISITION 1903 CAMBRIDGE

SIR,

THE Passage in my Book, that has given *my Lord* such displeasure, is this—*Who could imagine, that an inconsiderable number of peevish ignorant Presbyterians could ever come to be able to constrain a whole Kingdom to forswear the Religion, in which they had been bred*; (that is, *by imposing generally the Covenant*) *and to subvert their own Church upon a groundless suspicion, that the King had a design to change his Religion? who yet was almost the only Person that remained most constant in it*; *so as to hazard not only the ruin of his Estate, but the loss of his Life also. For the time was, when if he would have given up Episcopacy, he might have obtained, in all other respects, very tolerable conditions. Whereas several of the Wisest and Learnedst of his Clergy have been content to buy their security with a voluntary degrading of themselves from their Offices and Titles. Yea, it may be truly said, that though many of them have suffered in extremity, yet it was not properly with an eye to their Religion, but rather their Fidelity and their Loyalty to their Prince.* Exomolog. Pag. 2.

Now the ſpecial Clauſe in this Paſſage, that his Lordſhip charges not only with falſity, but with ſuch a falſity as was againſt my own knowledg and conſcience, is this, where I ſaid that *ſeveral of the Wiſeſt and Learnedſt of the Clergy have been content to buy their ſecurity with a voluntary degrading of themſelves from their Offices and Titles.* But I hope, when he ſhall be informed of my true ſincere meaning in this Clauſe (which I will here ſet down) his Lordſhip will judg more mildly of one, that to ſave his life, would not dare to publiſh in Print any thing that he knew to be falſe, eſpecially to injure others.

I do therefore profeſs, that by thoſe Words I had no intention to impute to the *Engliſh Clergy* indefinitely (eſpecially the *Biſhops*) the baſe actions of Dr. *Williams* the Archbiſhop of *York*, who by deſerting his Brethren, by putting on Armour, and being in the head of a Troop againſt the King, ſeemed to renounce not only his Office and Title of a *Biſhop*, but of an Eccleſiaſtical Perſon; or the ſordid ſacriledg of ſome *Scotiſh Biſhops*, who ſubmitted themſelves to the *Chair of Penance* for having been Biſhops.

But I reflected partly on all thoſe *Beneficed Prieſts*, very many of which continued in their *Livings* all the time of the *Rebellion*; which they could not do, without renouncing both the *Proteſtant Religion* and their *Loyalty*; but principally upon the generality of the *Biſhops*, who neglecting to perform the proper, and then moſt neceſſary, function of their *Order*, (which was to fulminate *Eccleſiaſtical Cenſure*, and *Excommunication* againſt all thoſe that Rebell'd againſt the *King*, and their *Eccleſiaſtical* Authority) did thereby ſignifie, that they voluntarily ceaſed to be *Biſhops*. This Office and Duty of a *Biſhop* I could never hear to have been performed by any one but only Dr. *Prideaux* then Biſhop of *Worceſter*: ſo that for Twenty years almoſt, *England* was as if it had no *Biſhop* at all.

Now I cannot imagine any poſſible excuſe for this neglect of theirs, and the deſerting their *Office*. For to ſay, that the doing of their Duty would have expos'd their Perſons to danger, is no excuſe before God, who requires of *Paſtors* to give their lives for their *Flocks* in times of ſuch temptation and danger. Or if they alledg that the fulminating of *Excommunications* would have had

had little or no effect; this would ſignifie that they did think, the *Eccleſiaſtical Authority* of the *Engliſh Church* is little more than *Political* or *Parliamentary*, not obliging the Conſciences of Subjects.

I am ſure, in the *Catholick Church*, *Cenſures* proceeding from *Popes* or *Biſhops* in ſuch like Caſes, tho Priſoners in Dungeons, would be dreadful to all under their Government. But indeed our *Biſhops* here have little reaſon to expect the like, ſince they acknowledg *Congregations* of *French Hugonots*, *Presbyterians*, *Lutherans*, &c. which have no *Epiſcopal Government*, or *Ordination*, to be yet *true Churches*. For whilſt they do ſo, how can they validly and with effect *Excommunicate* any of their *Rebels*, or *Deſertors*, who by their own grounds may lawfully deſert them, by entring into thoſe *Congregations*, which themſelves confeſs to be *true Churches of Chriſt*? ſo that their Souls are as ſafe after *Excommunication* as before, whatever become of their Livings.

This truly was my meaning in that paſſage, and I believe no Reader of my Book will think I could be ſo impudently fooliſh, as, with reference to the *Biſhops*, to report, that in a proper-literal ſence they had *degraded* themſelves, as if they had renounced their *Character*. But truly if we reflect on thoſe *Ordained Miniſters*, who continued in their *Livings*, and thereby declared themſelves *Members* of a *Church* Governed by an *Unordained Miniſtry*, they did properly *degrade* themſelves, and committed a *Sacriledg*, which by all the ancient *Canons* of the *Church* made them uncapable of ever exerciſing their Functions afterwards.

Now, Sir, I deſire you would pleaſe to let his *Lordſhip* underſtand, what I have ſaid to the *Charge* laid againſt me, with regard to this *Paſſage*. And withall, how that having been long ſince informed, that ſome of my Friends complain'd of it, who underſtood the expreſſion in too rigorous and literal a ſence, I had an intention to have expreſſed my mind more eaſily; but the *Corrections* which I had made of ſeveral paſſages, came too late to the *Printers* hands, when he was about a ſecond *Impreſſion*. So with my humble ſervice, I reſt

16 *July*. 1662. *Your moſt Affectionate*
Friend and humble Servant.

Biſhop *MORLEY'S*
ANSVVER
TO
Father Creſſeys Letter.



Now the ſpecial *Clauſe* in this *paſſage*, that his *Lordſhip* charges, not only with falſity, but with ſuch a falſity as was againſt my own knowledg and conſcience, is this, where I ſaid that *ſeveral of the Wiſeſt and Learnedſt of the Clergy have been content to buy their ſecurity with a voluntary degrading of themſelves from their Offices and Titles.*

IT was not this *Clauſe* only or ſpecially, that the *Biſhop* did, and the whole *Clergy of England* may moſt juſtly except againſt, as being falſe and injurious. For, *Firſt*, It is falſe and injurious to ſay, that the *Presbyterians* did conſtrain the *whole Kingdom* to forſwear the *Religion*, in which they had been bred: for it muſt be the *whole Kingdoms* taking (which is moſt notoriouſly untrue) and not the *Pres-*

Presbyterians generally impoſing of the *Covenant*, that muſt prove this Aſſertion. And if it be *untrue*, can any thing be more *injurious*, than to impute the forſwearing of their *Religion* to a whole Nation? and to do what one can, to make the World believe it? *Secondly*, Though it be very true, that the *King* was conſtant to his *Religion*, even to the hazard of his Eſtate and loſs of his Life, yet it is very falſe that he was almoſt the only Perſon that was ſo: for many *thouſands* beſides the *King* were conſtant in it, and ſuffered the loſs of their *Eſtates* by it, and were ready to ſacrifice their *Lives* for it; as many of them did actually and really, being deſtroyed by the Sword, by Famine, by Exile, by Impriſonment, *&c.*

And much of this the *Author* of this Paper ſaw before he went away, and could not chuſe but hear of the reſt, if he heard any thing at all what was done here. Which whether he did or not, I wonder with what conſcience or ingenuity he can affirm (as he doth in the *third* place) that divers of *the Wiſeſt and Learneſt of the Kings Clergy* were content to buy their ſecurity with a voluntary degrading of themſelves from their *Offices* and *Titles*; which, if true, was a foul and an inexcuſable *fault*; if falſe, it is a foul and inexcuſable *ſlander*. Let him therefore name thoſe ſeveral *the Wiſeſt and Learneſt of the Kings Clergy*: ſurely they were none of them any of his old Friends and Acquaintance, and yet he may mean them as well as any others, if what he ſaid before be true (*viz.*) that the *King* was almoſt the only Perſon

Perſon that was conſtant in his Religion. But perhaps he would have thought the *King* Wiſer, if he had not been ſo conſtant in it, ſeeing he affirms that they were of the *Wiſeſt and Learnedſt* men we had, that bought their ſecurity with a voluntary degrading of themſelves from their Offices and Titles. *Fourthly* and *Laſtly*, He affirms likewiſe that it may be truly ſaid, that though many of them (he means the *Clergy*) have ſuffered in extremity; yet it was not properly with an eye to their *Religion*, but rather to their *Fidelity* and *Loyalty* to their *Prince*. Now though in this Clauſe he grants, that many of us ſuffered in extremity, yet he adds, that it may be truly ſaid, that we did it not (that is) not one of thoſe many that ſuffered did it with an eye to their *Religion*, but to their *Loyalty* only. A bold and uncharitable Aſſertion. For, *Firſt*, How doth he know that this may be ſaid *truly*? Did all or any of thoſe many that ſuffered tell him ſo? And yet if all and every one did not tell him ſo, he cannot poſſibly know that it may be *truly* ſaid, that all of them did ſo; nay, he cannot without breach of Charity ſay that any of them did ſo, or that any of them had not an eye to their *Religion* in ſo doing. For may not a man have an eye to *Religion* in ſuffering for his *Loyalty*? Is not Obedience to our *Soveraign* a part of our *Religion*? I am ſure it is a part of *Our Religion*, if it be not a part of his; and we think him as much a *Martyr*, that dies in defence of the *fifth*, or any other of the *ten Commandments*, as he that dies in defence of any of the *Articles of the Creed*. And certainly if it had not been *Religion*,

or *Conscience towards God* that made us suffer for our *Loyalty to our Prince*, we might as easily have bought our security by quitting our *Loyalty*, as you say, several of the *Wisest* of us did by a voluntary degrading of themselves from their Titles and Offices; so that this whole *Passage*, and not one particular *Clause* of it only, is *false*, *scandalous*, and *injurious*, partly to the *Kings* whole *Party*, but especially to the *Orthodox* and conformable *Clergy* of the *Church of England*; and consequently, though he could have justified or excused any one particular Clause, yet that would not have satisfied the *Bishops*, nor any that are as much concerned in the other three as they are in that. Whereunto may be added, that many of those whom he confesseth to have *suffered in extremity*, cannot so properly be said to suffer for their Fidelity to the *King* as for their Fidelity to the *Church*, and to their *Religion*. For if they would have consented to the bringing in of the *Presbytery* instead of *Episcopacy*, and the *Directory* instead of the *Liturgy*, they might have enjoyed their *Liberties* and their *Livings* too, without being obliged to renounce their *Loyalty* to the *King*, as long as the *Presbyterians* were in Power.

But supposing he were justly chargeable but with that one *Clause* only, which he endeavours to excuse, yet is the *Apology* he makes for it altogether unsatisfactory: For, *First*, No *private acknowledgment* is a sufficient satisfaction for a *publick injury*, as he himself seems to confess, when he tells us, he had an intention to have expressed his mind otherwise, if the *corrections* he

he had made of ſeveral paſſages had not come too late to the *Printers* hand, when he was about a ſecond *Impreſſion.* And therefore if this *private acknowledgment* were as full of Ingenuity and Truth, as it is far from both, yet (even in his own judgment) it could not have made amends for the *publick injury* he had done our *Church*, by twice Publiſhing in *Print* ſuch a *cenſure* of it, as needed not only *explanations*, but *corrections*; and that not of one, but of ſeveral *Paſſages*, to give ſome colour of truth to it, and to leſſen the ſcandal of it. Which, all that he hath ſaid, or can ſay, will not do in any mans opinion but his own, and (as I verily believe) not in his own neither.

For, *Secondly*, The *Clauſe* he undertakes to juſtifie is a *Report* made by himſelf (for he neither names nor implies any other *Author* of it) of a *matter of fact* which muſt be either *true* or *falſe*, according to the natural, clear, obvious, and ordinary meaning of the Words, wherein it is reported; otherwiſe the *report* it ſelf, being of that nature as it is, muſt needs be not *falſe* only, but in a high degree *ſcandalous*, and *injurious* alſo, whatſoever other meaning he may afterwards pretend to have had in it; I ſay, whatſoever other meaning he may now pretend to have had then. For certainly, if his meaning had been then, as he now ſays it was, he is not ſo ill an expreſſer of himſelf but he could and would have done it in ſuch Words, as naturally carry ſuch a ſence with them, which I believe he himſelf will not ſay thoſe Words of his do. For his Words are theſe, *Several of the Wiſeſt and Learnedſt*

of his (that is of the *Kings*) *Clergy, have been content to buy their ſecurity with a voluntary degrading of themſelves from their Offices and Titles.* Where, *Firſt*, We are to obſerve that theſe words, as to the form of them, are poſitive, and peremptory; as if there were no doubt to be made but that they are exactly true in the full latitude and extent of them. And therefore, *Secondly*, We are to obſerve likewiſe, that they muſt be true, not of one Perſon only, but of ſeveral of the *Clergy*; and by *ſeveral*, muſt needs be meant ſome certain or uncertain number; but a number without doubt it muſt be, and ſuch a number, as might argue a great and notable defection from the *Church*: which two, or three, or four, nay, two, or three, or fourſcore could not have done in ſo numerous a *Clergy* as we have. Howſoever by *ſeveral* cannot be meant but one only; though that one were never ſo *wiſe*, or never ſo *learned*; and therefore the Inſtance he gives in the *Archbiſhop of York*'s prevarication and Apoſtacy will not come home to the proof of this particular; unleſs he can make it appear that others of the ſame *Order*, or at leaſt that others of the *Wiſeſt and Learnedſt of the Engliſh Clergy*, though of an Inferior Order, were guilty of the ſame crime that he was; But ſuch a guilt he profeſſeth it was not his intention to impute to the *Engliſh Clergy* indefinitely; eſpecially not unto the *Biſhops*. And yet, by his favour, he muſt prove that ſome other *Biſhops*, or at leaſt ſome others of the *Wiſeſt and Learnedſt of the Engliſh Clergy* were guilty of the ſame crime that he was; and did diſclaim the

Titles,

Titles, and *Offices*, they had in the *Church*, as that *Biſhop* did; or elſe he muſt confeſs his charging *of ſeveral of the Wiſeſt and Learnedſt of the Engliſh Clergy, with a voluntary degrading of themſelves from their Offices and Titles for their ſecurity*, to be a meer calumny: as if one ſhould ſay, that ſeveral of the *Colledg of the Apoſtles* deny'd *Chriſt*, becauſe *Peter* did ſo; or that ſeveral of them betrayed *Chriſt*, becauſe *Judas* did ſo; or that ſeveral of the *Popes* ſubſcribed the *Arrian Hæreſie*, becauſe Pope *Liberius* did ſo. What is this but an indefinite imputation of one mans crime to all, or moſt, or at leaſt, to many of the ſame *Order?* So that if Biſhop *Williams* his crime was his degrading himſelf from his Titles and Offices, as indeed it was; then he that ſaith *ſeveral of the Engliſh Clergy* did degrade themſelves from their Offices and Titles, muſt needs impute Biſhop *Williams's* Crime to the *Engliſh Clergy* indefinitely; becauſe he defines not whom nor how many he means by the word *ſeveral.* And yet, by ſaying that *ſeveral of the Wiſeſt and Learnedſt of the Clergy* did ſo weakly or wickedly behave themſelves; he ſeems to imply that the reſt, that were not ſo *Wiſe* or ſo *Learned*, were miſled by their example: and therefore at length he confeſſeth, that indeed thoſe of the *Engliſh Clergy*, he reflected upon in this charge, were partly ſuch *Beneficed Prieſts*, as held their *Livings* during all the time of the *Rebellion*, which he ſaith were many; and partly, nay, principally, the generality of the *Biſhops.* But why did he, or how could he reflect upon either *Beneficed Prieſts*, or *Biſhops* in this charge?

For

For, *First*, How does he know that those *Beneficed Priests*, that held their *Livings* all the time of the *Rebellion*, were the *Wisest and Learnedst of the English Clergy*? for if they were not, they come not within compass of his charge. *Secondly*, How does the holding of their *Livings* prove that they voluntarily degraded themselves from their *Titles* and *Offices*? which is the substance of the Charge: one would think it rather proved the contrary. And therefore how many, or how faulty soever such men were, they were not faulty in that respect he then specified, and consequently, whatsoever he saith now, he could not then reflect upon them under any such notion. And yet they were not so *many*, nor perhaps so *faulty* neither, as he would have them thought to be. For certainly, never any *Church*, under so great and general a Persecution as ours was, had fewer of her Children fell away from her, than ours had; neither is that which he takes for granted true, namely, that none did, or could keep their *Livings* without renouncing the *Protestant Religion*, and their *Loyalty*. For many *Livings* were so poor, that the haughty *Presbyterians* disdained to stoop to them, and therefore suffered those that were owners of them to continue in them, though they read the *Liturgy*, and professed and Preached for *Loyalty*: and of these I know and can name divers, as I can some others likewise, whose interest and reputation for Piety and Learning was so great in the Countries wherein they lived, that their Enemies thought it better to expect their Deaths, than by depriving them of

of their *Benefices*, to contract ſo much hatred, as they ſhould have done unto themſelves. And of theſe I will name but one for all, *viz.* the Reverend, Learned, and Pious Dr. *Sanderſon*, (now Biſhop of *Lincoln*) who notwithſtanding he was for the aforeſaid reaſon ſuffered to keep his *Benefice*, yet I think no man will be ſo impudently malicious as to ſay, that he renounced either his *Religion* or his *Loyalty* by ſo doing. For he never took the *Covenant*, nor *Ingagement*, nor ever uſed the *Directory*, but officiated always as he ought to do; and always maintained both the *Doctrine* and *Diſcipline* of our *Church*, as well publickly in *Print*, as privately in his *Pulpit*; witneſs his *Judicium Oxonienſe*, his *Lectures* touching the *Obligation of Oaths*, and that excellent Volume of *Sermons*, all Printed, or Reprinted, and owned by him, during the time of the *Rebellion*, together with that Learned, Judicious, and Reſolute *Preface* (before his Book of *Sermons*) wherein the *Authority*, *Government* and *Diſcipline* of the *Church of England* is unanſwerably aſſerted againſt the *Presbyterians* and all other *Sects* and *Sectaries*, who then domineered in and over the whole Kingdom. In the mean time I will not deny, that there were ſome that did revolt from the *Church*, and perhaps from their *Loyalty* alſo rather than they would ſuffer Perſecution, but they were not (even in his opinion, I dare ſay) either of the *Wiſeſt* or *Learneſt* of our *Clergy*; and conſequently, could not fall under his conſideration, when he Penned and Printed this Accuſation. And beſides, they were a very ſmall inconſiderable number,

ber, in reſpect of thoſe many *hundreds* (I think I may ſay *thouſands*) that choſe rather to be ejected and undone than to Conform to the then preſent Government either in *Church* or *State*. And truly if the *Author* of this Charge had not lookt aſquint upon our *Church*, he might aſwell have taken notice of thoſe (who were for number much more viſible, and for quality and qualifications much more conſiderable) as of the former. And he might have taken notice too, that of thoſe that were ejected out of their own *Churches*, many did in ſeveral places of the *Kingdom*, and eſpecially in ſeveral places of *London*, Preach up the ſame Doctrine of *Loyalty* and *Conformity* to the *Articles* and *Canons* of the *Church*, for which they had been ejected. And this they did with the apparent hazard not of their *Liberties* only, but even of their *Lives* alſo; neither could any threatnings or ſufferings of others or their own diſcourage them from ſo doing. By which Heroical Courage and Conſtancy, they kept up the hearts of all the *Kings Party*, and did not only preſerve a ſeed to the *Church*, but ſo many Seminaries of *Loyalty*, and Treaſuries of *Charity*, as they had *Congregations* in and about *London*, and throughout the whole *Kingdom*; being notably aſſiſted in this great work by divers others of their ejected *Brethren*, ſome writing and owning the *Books* which they writ in defence of the *King*, and of the *Church*: others officiating in *Noblemens*, and *Gentlemens Houſes*, and others teaching *Schools*, and thereby taking care that there might be perpetual *Nurſeries*, and a continual ſupply of well inſtructed

inſtructed and well-affected *Chriſtians* and *Subjects*. And to that courage, induſtry, care, and zeal of theſe ejected and undone men, do we owe (next under God) the preſervation, and reſtitution of our *Church*, and of our *Monarchy* it ſelf alſo; ſo that it ſeems the ſame Providence that ſuffered the *Primitive Chriſtians* to be driven out of *Hieruſalem* by *Herods* Perſecution, to the end that being diſperſed, they might diſperſe the Goſpel in all the Cities and Villages both of *Judea*, and *Samaria*: the ſame Providence, I ſay, ſeems to have ſuffered thoſe *Heroical Confeſſors*, we now ſpeak of, to be ejected out of their own particular Stations by the late Perſecution here in *England*, that being diſperſed as they were over the whole Nation, they might ſow the ſeeds of *Loyalty* and *Truth*, and check the growth of *Hæreſie* and *Schiſm* and *Rebellion*, in all places of the Kingdom. So that if we caſt up the account right, we ſhall find but very few of the *Engliſh Prieſts*, properly ſo called, whether Beneficed or Unbeneficed, that did not behave themſelves ſo as not to ſhame their Mother the *Church of England*, nor to give this, nor any other of her Adverſaries juſt cauſe to reproach her with them, or for them.

But perhaps we ſhall find the *Biſhops* to have been much more faulty than the *Prieſts*; for it was upon the *Biſhops*, and the *Generality of the Biſhops* that he did (as he tells us now) principally reflect, when he told the World in Print, that *ſeveral of the Wiſeſt and Learnedſt of the Engliſh Clergy were content to buy their ſecurity with a voluntary degrading themſelves from their Offices and*

Titles: and conſequently he is obliged to prove that the *Engliſh Biſhops* did generally and voluntarily degrade themſelves from their Offices and Titles, in order to the ſecurity of their Perſons. But does he, or can he prove; nay, does he ſo much as offer to prove any thing towards the making good any part or parcel of this charge? certainly he does not. For ſuppoſing *Excommunication* to be not a neceſſary *function* (as he calls it) but a neceſſary *Duty* of the *Epiſcopal Order*: yet (I hope) it is not neceſſary to be exerciſed at all times, on all Offenders, in all conjunctures, and without all probability or poſſibility of doing any good by it. Nay, ſuppoſing it had been a neceſſary part of the *Biſhops* Duty to Excommunicate all the *Rebels* and *Schiſmaticks* that then were; and that the *Biſhops* did then generally forbear to perform that neceſſary Part, or Duty of their *Office*; doth it therefore follow that they did voluntarily degrade themſelves from the *Office* and *Title* of a *Biſhop*? Is there nothing elſe belongs to the *Office* of a *Biſhop* but *Excommunication*? Or does a man ceaſe to be an *Officer*, becauſe he forbears or neglects to exerciſe ſome one Part, of Duty of his *Office*? Is it not a principal and neceſſary part of the *Popes* Duty (being, as you ſay, the common *Father of Chriſtendom*) to do what he can to make and preſerve Peace between *Chriſtian Princes*? And hath not ſome one *Pope* or other neglected, or forborn to do this Duty? Nay, Have not many of them done the contrary? And did they therefore ceaſe to be *Popes*, or degrade themſelves from the *Office* and

Title

Title of the *Papacy* by ſo doing? Would you not laugh at any man that ſhould argue againſt the *Pope* in this manner? And ſhall that which would be ridiculous in us, when urged againſt you, be rational in you, when urged againſt us? But ſuppoſing yet farther that our *Biſhops* did deſerve to be degraded for not Excommunicating the *Rebels* and *Schiſmaticks*, doth it therefore follow that they did voluntarily *degrade* themſelves, or that they did thereby ſignifie that they did voluntarily ceaſe to be *Biſhops*? If they did ſo, why did they then and ſince make *Prieſts* and *Deacons*, give *Inſtitution* to Cures of Souls, and *Confirm* Children? all which are Acts of *Epiſcopal Office*, and conſequently could not or would not have been done (as I am ſure they were done) by thoſe Reverend Perſons, if they had voluntarily ceaſed to be *Biſhops*. For as long as a Man Officiates as ſuch or ſuch an *Officer*, he cannot be ſaid willingly to abandon or renounce ſuch or ſuch an *Office*. And therefore if our *Biſhops* by forbearing to *Excommunicate* thoſe whom their *Epiſcopal Office* (as he ſaith) obliged them to Excommunicate; if they had meant (I ſay) by this omiſſion to ſignifie their voluntary ceaſing to be *Biſhops*, they would not at the ſame time have done other *Epiſcopal Acts*, which muſt needs ſignifie the contrary. So that their forbearing to *Excommunicate* thoſe *Rebels* and *Schiſmaticks* (though it had been their Duty to do it) cannot prove they ceaſed to be *Biſhops*, and much leſs that they voluntarily ceaſed to be *Biſhops*, which indeed nothing they did, or did not, could ſignifie, but their own publick

diſclaiming both of the *Title* and of the *Office*: as Archbiſhop *Williams*, and ſome *Scotch-Biſhops* did. And this (as he told us before) he will not impute to our *Biſhops*. So that if our *Biſhops* were never ſo guilty of that crime he lays to their charge, in forbearing to Excommunicate the *Rebels*, yet this being not the ſame crime he laid unto their charge in his *Book* formerly, that muſt ſtill (until it be proved) be taken for a *ſlander*: neither muſt he be believed in ſaying he reflected upon *this*, when he writ *that*, there being no reſemblance at all of the one unto the other. But what if they were not obliged to *Excommunicate* thoſe *Rebels* and *Schiſmaticks*? Or at leaſt, What if they thought they had no ſuch Obligation? Can it then be truly, or charitably, or rationally affirmed, that they did *degrade* themſelves from their *Offices* and *Titles*, or that they did voluntarily ceaſe to be *Biſhops*; becauſe they did not what they were not, or what they thought they were not obliged to do? Sure it is not demonſtrable that they were bound to do ſo; at leaſt not under the penalty of forfeiting their *Titles* and *Offices*, if they did not do ſo; and therefore they might probably enough believe that they had no ſuch obligation at all, or at leaſt not under ſuch a Penalty, and then it was not poſſible for them by ſuch an omiſſion to ſignifie that they did voluntarily ceaſe to be *Biſhops*.

Nay, what if really and truly there was no ſuch obligation incumbent upon them? Truly I for my part do verily believe there was not, neither is there any thing in this Paper weighty enough to make me change

change my opinion. For what though *Excommunication* be a proper Act of the *Epiſcopal Office* (as indeed it is) doth it therefore follow that a *Biſhop* may not ſometimes forbear to exerciſe this Act, and that not innocently only, but prudently alſo? 'tis the *Biſhops* Duty indeed to *Excommunicate* notorious and obſtinate *Offenders*; but neither all ſuch Offenders, nor at all times, nor in all caſes. For, *Firſt*, There are ſome notorious and obſtinate *Offenders*, that cannot be Excommunicated, namely, *Pagans*, *Turks*, *Jews*, and whoſoever elſe there are that are not of the *Chriſtian Church*. For how can they be caſt out of the *Church* by *Excommunication*, that were never yet within the *Church* by *Baptiſm*? *Secondly*, of thoſe even within the *Church* there be ſome likewiſe, that though they be never ſo notorious, and never ſo obſtinate *Sinners*, yet ſpeaking properly, they cannot be *Excommunicated*. For the *Author* of this Paper well knows, that according to their *Canon-Law*, a *Kingdom*, a *Community*, a *Corporation*, or a *Body Politick*, though it may be *Interdicted*, yet it cannot be *Excommunicated*: And therefore our *Biſhops*, even according to their *Law*, could not *Excommunicate* both or either of the *Houſes of Parliament*, which were the moſt faulty, the moſt notorious, and the moſt obſtinate *Offenders* of all others. If it be replied, that we might have *Interdicted* them, and forbid any of the Divine *Offices* to be done to them, I anſwer, by asking whom ſhould we have forbid to do thoſe *Offices*? Our own *Clergy* or theirs? *Ours* they themſelves had ſilenced; and *Theirs* would not be

ſilenced

ſilenced by Us: And as we could not exerciſe *Interdiction* againſt the one, ſo we could not exerciſe *Suſpenſion* againſt the other neither. But why did we not *Excommunicate* thoſe *Perſons* that adhered to the *Parliament* in their *Rebellion* againſt the *King*, and to thoſe *Preachers* in their *Schiſm* againſt the *Church?* I anſwer, becauſe we would not *caſt Pearls before Swine*; we would not prophane *Gods Ordinance* by uſing it, when we knew we ſhould do them no good, and might do our ſelves much harm by it. If it be demanded, how we knew we ſhould do no good by it? I anſwer, becauſe we knew they had entred into a ſolemn *Covenant* againſt the *Epiſcopal Office* and *Authority*; and conſequently, we were ſure they would but deſpiſe, and deride us the more for making uſe of our *Authority*. Beſides, the *Biſhops* had formerly made a tryal of their *Authority* upon another occaſion, I mean, when thirteen of them made a ſolemn and publick *Proteſtation* againſt the forcible keeping of them out of the Houſe of *Peers*; and were Impeached of *High Treaſon*, and clapt up in the *Tower* for ſo doing. And therefore, they had afterwards no reaſon to expoſe the *Authority* and *Honour*, not of their own *Order* and *Perſons* only, but of *Gods Ordinance*, and *Authority*, and *Honour* alſo, to a ſecond, and probably a worſe, and more ſcandalous affront than the former. For *whoſoever deſpiſeth you deſpiſeth me*, ſaith *Chriſt*; and (I think) the *Biſhops* were not obliged to expoſe either *Chriſt* or *themſelves* to deſpight and contempt (I ſay) unneceſſarily, and to no purpoſe. For though *Excommunication*

tion be neceſſary at ſome times, and in ſome caſes, yet at that time, and in that caſe (whatſoever the *Author* of this Paper ſaith to the contrary) it was not neceſſary: for if it were neceſſary at all, it was neceſſary either for the honour of the *Church* that was to inflict it, or for the cutting thoſe off from the *Church* upon whom it was to be inflicted, or for the ſeparating and ſecuring of thoſe that were *Orthodox* and *Loyal*, from thoſe that were *Schiſmaticks* and *Rebels*. But it was not neceſſary in all, or any of theſe reſpects, and conſequently, it was altogether unneceſſary. And, *Firſt*, It was not neceſſary to vindicate the honour of the *Church*, by making it appear unto the World, that ſhe deteſted and abhorred both the *Schiſm* and the *Rebellion*, and that ſhe neither would, nor did take thoſe for her *Children*, that were ingaged in both or either of thoſe *Crimes* as long as they continued to be ſo; for this had often, and ſufficiently, and abundantly been done already, both from the *Pulpit* and from the *Preſs*, by our *Words*, and by our *Actions*, and not by our *Doings* only, but our *Sufferings* alſo; by all which ways, and means, the *Churches* judgment concerning thoſe men, and their manners, was notoriouſly and convincingly manifeſted unto them, and unto the whole World; and conſequently, there was no need of any formal *Excommunication* to that purpoſe.

Again, as it was not neceſſary on the *Churches* part to inflict it, ſo it was not neceſſary on the *Offenders* part to have it inflicted: for what need was there of cutting them off from the *Church*, that had cut themſelves off

off from it already? Or of forbidding them to come unto our *Assemblies*, or to our *Prayers*, or to our *Sacraments*, who were before-hand professedly and obstinately resolved, they would have no *Communion* at all with us.

And as they by their *Solemn League and Covenant* had obliged themselves, and their whole Party, to have no *Communion* with us, so we, and our whole Party were obliged by the *Laws of God*, and of the *Church*, to have no *Communion* with them; and therefore, *Thirdly*, There was no need of a formal or judicial *Excommunication* to separate the precious from the vile; those that were *Orthodox* and *Loyal*, from those that were *Schismaticks* and *Rebels*; who were already enough (if not more than enough) divided, and separated from one another, and that not in Judgment only, but in Affection and Faction also.

And all this the *Bishops* knew well enough, and therefore they thought they were not obliged to draw that Sword; nay, they thought they were obliged not to draw that Sword of *Excommunication* to cut nothing but the Ayr with it; or by striking upon a Rock to blunt and break the edg of it; and consequently to make it the less powerful and effectual, when it should be indeed for the *Churches* honour to use it, and when there might be hope at least of doing some good by it.

For though (as he saith, and as we willingly confess) it is no excuse before God for the *Bishops* to say, that the Doing of their Duty would have exposed their

their Perſons unto danger; yet to expoſe their Perſons to danger by doing of that which was not their Duty; as for the reaſons aforeſaid, the uſe of *Excommunication* was not at that time and in that caſe; would have been but a vain oſtentation of ſomething that would have ſignified nothing, together with a temptation of God by needleſs expoſing, not their *Perſons* only, but their *Order* it ſelf to be ruin'd by it; for who can tell, whether that thoſe that impriſoned ſo many *Biſhops*, and took away all their *Votes*, and right of ſuffrage in the Houſe of *Peers*, for their aforeſaid neceſſary *Proteſtation*, would not have taken away their lives, if they had proceeded either to an *Interdiction* of both Houſes of *Parliament*, or to an *Excommunication* of all ſuch particular Perſons, as did, or ſhould adhere to them; and if they had taken away the lives of the *Biſhops* that then were, what would have become of the *Epiſcopal Order* here, or of our *Church* it ſelf without that *Order*: for where or from whence ſhould we have had more *Biſhops?* the Church of *Rome* would not have Conſecrated any for us, but upon ſuch terms as we could not have admitted; the *Græcian*, and other *Eaſtern* and *Southern* Churches were too far off from us; whether the *Lutherans* would, or could have done it, we cannot tell; we are ſure thoſe that follow *Calvins* model, could not. The *Biſhops* therefore had very good reaſon to be careful of not expoſing themſelves, becauſe together with themſelves they did probably expoſe their *Order* it ſelf, and conſequently the *Apoſtolical* frame and conſtitution of our

Church to extream danger of a total *interciſion* at leaſt, if not a final *exciſion* alſo.

If it be replied that we ought to have relied upon the Divine *Providence* for the *future*, and in the mean time to have done that which was our *Duty* to do for the *preſent*: I anſwer, as *Affirmative Precepts*, ſo *Affirmative Duties*, do not bind *ad ſemper*; for though, that which is *evil* muſt never be done, yet that which is *good* may ſometimes be omitted; eſpecially when it is but matter of *Diſcipline*, and when with apparent danger to our ſelves we have no hope of doing any good to others by it; for here our Saviours own *Rule* is, *Give not that which is holy unto dogs; leſt they turn and tear you in pieces* for your pains: and this was our very Caſe at that time.

Neither doth it follow, that becauſe we thought the fulminating of *Excommunication* (as he calls it) at that time, and againſt that Party, would have had little or no effect; that therefore we did think the *Eccleſiaſtical Authority* of the *Engliſh Church* is little more than *Political*, or *Parliamentary*, not obliging the Conſciences of Subjects. Though I confeſs I do not well underſtand, what his meaning is in this paſſage: for if we do think the *Eccleſiaſtical Authority* of our *Church* to be more than *Political* and *Parliamentary*, (which he grants we do) we muſt needs think, what he ſays we do not think, namely, that our Churches *Eccleſiaſtical* Authority doth oblige the Conſciences of Subjects, becauſe we do think that meer *Political* and *Parliamentary* Authority doth oblige Subjects even in point of Con-

Conſcience alſo; ſo that how he can reconcile himſelf unto himſelf in this particular, *Ipſe viderit*; I ſee not how we are preſt at all with it. For we think the Power of *Excommunication* in the *Church* to be more than either a *Political*, a *Parliamentary* or a meerly *Eccleſiaſtical* conſtitution, as being an *Ordinance* and *Inſtitution*, neither of the *State* nor of the *Church*, but of *Chriſt* himſelf; and conſequently, more immediately obliging the Conſcience, than any humane conſtitution can do, whether it be *Civil*, or *Eccleſiaſtical*: but then we know likewiſe, that as men may think their Conſciences to be obliged by that which doth not really oblige them: ſo they may not think their Conſciences to be obliged by that which really doth not oblige them. And we know likewiſe that it is not mens being obliged, but their being perſwaded, or convinced they are obliged, that makes them ſenſible, or inſenſible of ſuch an obligation; and to behave themſelves accordingly; and conſequently, to be more or leſs, or not at all affected with it. So that it was not what we thought of our *Churches Authority* in point of *Excommunication*, but what they thought of it, againſt whom we were to uſe it, that was to be our meaſure, whereby we were to judg what effects it was likely to produce in them, who being *Apoſtates*, as well as *Rebells*, and profeſſed Enemies to *Epiſcopacy*, as well as *Monarchy*, would no doubt, have trampled upon the *Cenſures* of the *Church* as well as they had done upon the *Laws* of the *Land*; and therefore the more ſacred and the more obliging we thought the *Authority* of our *Church* to be, the leſs reaſon we had to expoſe it to the contempt

and ſcorn of ſuch incorrigible and profane Perſons.

But he is ſure (he ſays) that in the *Catholick Church*, (he means the particular Univerſal Church of *Rome*) *Cenſures* proceeding from *Popes*, or *Biſhops*, in ſuch like Caſes, (though Priſoners in Dungeons) would be dreadful to all under their Government. But would they be dreadful to any that are not under their Government? (for this was our caſe) I trow not. I am ſure they have found it, and will find it to be otherwiſe, as often as they have, or ſhall make tryal of thoſe *Cenſures* againſt ſuch, as own not themſelves to be their *Subjects*, howſoever they may think that of right they ought to be their Subjects; for it is not ſubjection *de jure*, but *de facto*, that makes the threatnings or commands of Superiors to be feared or obeyed. So that it doth not argue our *Church* to be of leſs Authority, or her *Cenſures* to be of leſs Efficacy than thoſe of the Church of *Rome*, becauſe her Cenſures are terrible to thoſe that are under her Government, and that own her Authority, but ours are not terrible to thoſe that are not under our Churches Government, nor doe not own her Authority: And yet he takes that of theirs, and this of ours to be the like Caſes; whereas they are as unlike as two contraries can be the one unto the other.

But are the *Popes* Cenſures always ſo dreadful to all even of thoſe who are profeſſedly under his Government, as the Author of this Paper would make us believe they are? He confidently affirms they would be ſo (though the *Pope* were in a Dungeon) perhaps he means they ſhould be ſo; I am ſure they have not been

been ſo; for when *Clement* the VII was, after the Sacking of *Rome*, firſt made to ride backward upon an Aſs, and afterwards Impriſoned by an Army of the Emperor *Charles* the V. why did he not fulminate the Sentence of *Excommunication* againſt the *Emperor* (who profeſſed himſelf to be under his Government, and to be a Son of that *Church*, even at that time) if he had thought in earneſt, that ſuch a *fulmination* would have been ſo dreadful to all under his Government? Surely never had any *Pope* more need to have made himſelf terrible than he had at that time: nor ever did any Son of any *Church* more groſly and ſhamefully affront his *Spiritual Father*, or more deſerve to be ſeverely chaſtiſed by him than *Charles* then did: And yet I do not find that *Clement* fulminated againſt *Charles* when he was in the Dungeon, though he had ſix Months time to do it: nor afterwards neither, though he had ſtomach enough to reſent it. But *Charles* was too powerful and too fortunate a Prince to be terrified, or provoked; and *Popes* have had little ſucceſs in ſuch proceedings, but when they have had to do with weak and unfortunate Princes. And it had been well for the *Church of Rome* if this *Pope's* Succeſſor *Paul* the III. had uſed the like prudence and temper, when by Excommunicating our *Henry* the VIII. inſtead of reducing him, he did alienate him altogether, and with him this whole Kingdom from the *Papacy*. Of as little terror was *Pius* V. his fulmination againſt Queen *Elizabeth*, or that of *Paulus* V. againſt the *Venetians*. To conclude, what is here ſaid of the terrible efficacy of the *Popes Cenſures*, is like the thing it ſpeaks of, a great crack, and no more. Nei-

Neither is that more conſiderable which he adds as a reaſon; why we are not to expect ſuch effects of our *Excommunication* of our *Rebels*, and *Deſertors*, as they have found of theirs; namely, our allowing thoſe to whom they may joyn themſelves when they deſert us (*viz.*) either *Lutherans* or *Presbyterians*, to be true *Churches of Chriſt*; and conſequently, if they be not Excommunicated by them, as well as by us, they may, notwithſtanding our *Excommunication* be ſtill within the *Church*: Whereas, as he implies, when they *Excommunicate* any, let them go whither they will, they can be of no *Church* at all, becauſe there is no other *Church* in the World but theirs only. But this, ſay we, is but *gratis dictum*, and indeed ſuch another brag as the former; for whatſoever they ſay, we know there be other *Churches of Chriſt* beſides theirs; and moreover that our own is a truer *Church of Chriſt* than theirs is; but ſuppoſing theirs was the true, and only true *Church*, yet if thoſe that deſert them do not think it to be ſo, their Excommunicating them out of their *Church* will not make them believe that therefore they can be of no *Church*, or that they cannot be of a *true Church*, and conſequently, our *Excommunication* of thoſe that are the *Deſertors* of our *Church*, may be as effectual as their Excommunication of the Deſertors of their Church, though we ſhould allow ſome, and they allow none, beſides their own to be *true Churches*; for thoſe that deſert any *Church* (whether it be theirs or ours) and go unto another, muſt needs think (whether truly or falſly it matters not) as well, or better of the *Church* they go to, than of the *Church* they went from, and therefore will not value any *Cenſure*

ſure of the one to the prejudice of the other. *Hic ſumus ergo pares.* Neither could he but ſee the inconſequence of this Argument; but the reaſon why he makes uſe of it, is to throw a bone of Diviſion betwixt us, and all others that are of the *Proteſtant* Profeſſion, by obliging us either to approve them as true, or truly conſtituted *Churches*, or to condemn them as no Churches; but as we need not do the one, ſo we liſt not to do the other. *Nobis non licet eſſe tam ſeveris.* Our *Church* is not ſo liberal of her *Anathema's* as theirs is. We are ſure our *Church* is truly *Apoſtolical*, and that for *Government* and *Diſcipline*, as well as *Doctrine*. Whether the *Chriſtian Congregations* in other *Proteſtant Countries* be ſo or no, *Ætatem habent, reſpondeant pro ſemetipſis, & Domino ſuo ſtent vel cadant.* In the mean time our *Church* hath declared * *That no man ſhall be accounted or taken to be a lawful Biſhop, Prieſt or Deacon in the Church of England, or ſuffered to exerciſe any of thoſe ſacred functions, except he be called, tryed, examined, and admitted thereunto, according unto the form hereafter following*: or unleſs he had formerly *Epiſcopal Conſecration*, or *Ordination*.

* In the *Preface* before the Books of *Ordination*.

And now having anſwered all that he hath ſaid *de novo* in this Paper, I muſt needs tell him, that if it had been all unanſwerably and demonſtratively true, yet it would have done nothing to the *Biſhops* ſatisfaction; becauſe it would have done nothing towards the juſtification of any part of that ſcandalous paſſage againſt the *Church of England* in his printed *Book*. For ſuppoſing it to be moſt true that many of the *Orthodox Clergy* continued in their Benefices during thoſe times; as likewiſe, that the *Biſhops* did not exerciſe a neceſſary part of their function in Excommunicating the *Rebels* and *Schiſmaticks*; and moreover, that the reaſon why they did not, was either their fear to expoſe their Perſons to danger,

danger, or their thinking that our *Churches Authority*, being little more than *Political* and *Parliamentary*, did not oblige the Conſcience; or laſtly their acknowledging ſome Churches beſides their own to be true Churches of *Chriſt*: ſuppoſing (I ſay) but not granting all and every one of theſe Aſſertions to be moſt true, will it therefore follow by any juſt or rational conſequence, that either the *Presbyterians* did conſtrain the whole Kingdom to forſwear the *Religion* in which they had been bred? Or, *Secondly*, That the *King* was almoſt the only Perſon that remained conſtant in his Religion? Or, *Thirdly*, That ſeveral of the *Wiſeſt and Learnedſt* of our *Clergy* were content to buy their ſecurity with a voluntary degrading of themſelves from their Offices and Titles? Or, *Laſtly*, that it may be truly ſaid, that though many of us ſuffered in extremity, yet it was not properly with an eye to our *Religion*, but rather to our *Fidelity* and *Loyalty* to our Prince? If all, or any (I ſay) of theſe *Concluſions* can rationally, or probably be inferred from any or all of the former *Premiſſes* in any indifferent mans judgment, I will then confeſs that it is I that am *calumniæ reus*, and not he; but till then I cannot but believe that he believes himſelf to be ſo, unleſs he will confeſs ingenuouſly what (as I am credibly informed) he may confeſs truly, that this whole paſſage was put into his *Book* by another hand without his knowledg, and that as he was forced to own it in his firſt, ſo he was not permitted to retract or correct it (as he calls it) in his ſecond *Edition*. And then let any man judg what a Tyranny thoſe that are of the Church of *Rome*, and eſpecially thoſe that revolt to the Church of *Rome* muſt live under, and how impoſſible it is for the World to know whether what ſuch men write or aſſert in Print, be not indeed quite contrary to what themſelves do really believe or no. *FINIS.*

A

SERMON

Preached before the

KING

AT

WHITE-HALL,

November 5. 1667.

By the Right Reverend Father in God.

GEORGE Lord Biſhop of *Winton*,

WHILEST

He was Dean of the CHAPPEL-ROYAL.

LONDON:

Printed for *Joanna Brome*. 1683.

A

SERMON

Preached before the

KING

AT

WHITE-HALL,

November 5. 1667.

By the Right Reverend Father in God,

GEORGE Lord Bishop of Winton,

HIS

Dean of the CHAPEL-ROYAL.

LONDON:

Printed for Joanna Brome. 1683.

A SERMON ON

1 Cor. Cap. xiv. Ver. xxxiii.

For God is not the Author of Confuſion, but of Peace.

THAT there is a *God*, and that this God was the Maker, and is the Preſerver, and Diſpoſer of all things, is a Truth generally conſented to by all Mankind. Again, that this *God*, who made us, and preſerves us, and provides for us, is to be *Worſhipped*, and *Adored*, and *Obeyed* by us; no Man, that acknowledgeth there is ſuch a God, can be ſo unreaſonable as to deny. Laſtly, that there can be no Way of Worſhipping, or of Serving God, ſo Fit, ſo Safe, or ſo Acceptable unto him, as that which himſelf preſcribes, I preſume there is no conſidering Perſon but he muſt needs grant. And therefore, all Wiſe Men that ever took upon them to teach *Religion*, or the Way to ſerve God, howſoever they have differed in the *Matter* of their Doctrine, they have always agreed in the *Manner* of propoſing, or

Tradition of it, whileſt either they *pretended falſly*, or *profeſſed truly* ſome Divine *Revelation*, or other, to authorize and countenance whatſoever Religion it was, which they taught the People.

Thus *Numa Pompilius* (though he himſelf deviſed all that ridiculous rabble of Superſtitious *Ceremonies* with which he taught the Pagan *Romans* to Worſhip their falſe Gods) yet he pretended a Divine Revelation from the Goddeſs *Egeria* for them all. And thus *Mahomet*, that impious and impure Impoſtor, pretended an Inſpiration from the *Holy Ghoſt* (by the whiſpering of a *Dove* into his Ear) for all that *Farrago* or *Hotch-potch* of lies and blaſphemies in his curſed *Alcoran*, whereby ſo great a part of the World hath been ſo groſly abuſed, and ſo ſtrangely ſeduced for above a thouſand years together. To conclude, there never was any *Religion* in the World, (whoſoever was the Deviſer, or Teacher of it) but it was always fathered upon God; whereby it plainly appears, that even thoſe men that taught others to Worſhip God *falſly*, did themſelves believe, that none could be taught to Worſhip God *truly*, but by God himſelf, or by ſuch as were taught of him, what they were to teach others.

And therefore what the Deviſers and Teachers of all *falſe Religions* pretended falſly; the very ſame did the Teachers of *true Religion* profeſs truly, namely, that they were ſent from God, and that the Doctrine which they taught others was neither more nor leſs than that what God himſelf had taught them. Thus *Moſes* the Lawgiver of the *Old Teſtament*, was but Gods mouth

mouth whereby he ſpake unto the *Jews*, as *Aaron* was his mouth when he ſpake unto *Pharaoh*; nay, thus even our Saviour *Chriſt* himſelf, the Law-giver of the *New Teſtament*, tells us that he ſpake not of himſelf, but as he had heard of his Father: *For my Doctrine* (ſaith he) *is not mine, but his that ſent me*, Joh. 7. 16.

Now as the Doctrine which *Moſes* and the *Prophets* at firſt taught the *Jews*, ſo the Doctrine which *Chriſt* and his *Apoſtles* at firſt taught the *Chriſtians*, was evidenced to come from God, or to be the Truth of God, by their doing of ſuch things for the Confirmation of it, as none could do but God, or could not be done but by the power of God. But then as in the *Jewiſh Church* after *Moſes* and the *Prophets* were dead and gone, there were ſome that ſate in *Moſes* Chair, who did in the name of *Moſes* and the *Prophets*, teach the People to *believe* and *do* ſuch things as never were taught either by *Moſes*, or any of the *Prophets*: ſo in the *Chriſtian Church* likewiſe, after *Chriſt* and his *Apoſtles* were gone, there were ſome that ſucceeded them in the Governing and Teaching of the Church, eſpecially ſome of thoſe that pretended to ſit in St. *Peter's* Chair, who in the name of *Chriſt* and his *Apoſtles*, have introduced ſuch *Doctrines* and *Practiſes* into the *Chriſtian* World, as never were taught by *Chriſt*, or any of his *Apoſtles*; nay, ſuch as are quite contrary to the *Belief* and *Practiſe* of the *firſt Chriſtians*.

Again, as ſome of thoſe who ſate in *Moſes's* Chair, perceiving there was nothing in the Writings of *Moſes*, or the *Prophets* (rightly underſtood) to countenance them in their own Ambitious, and Covetous Deſigns, and

and yet not daring *in terminis*, or point-blank to contradict the Doctrine of *Moſes*, or the *Prophets*, for fear of the *Jews*, they did either wreſt, what *Moſes* and the *Prophets* had written, to their own ſenſe, by falſe *Gloſſes* and *Interpretations*, as the *Scribes* did, (witneſs *Chriſts Sermon upon the Mount* to convince them of it) or they did pretend to *unwritten Traditions* ſucceſſively derived to them from *Moſes*, and the *Prophets*; and conſequently of equal Authority to the *Prophetical* Writings themſelves; as the *Phariſees* taught the People, and thereby did not only teach them to Worſhip God in vain *by teaching for Doctrines the Traditions of men*, Matt. 15. 9. but *to make the Word of God it ſelf of none effect*, Mark 7. 13. The *former*, when by ſome of their Traditions they made more than God had commanded by *Moſes* or the *Prophets* to be neceſſary; the *latter*, when by other of their Traditions they made that which God had commanded by *Moſes* and the *Prophets*, not to be neceſſary; even ſo, or juſt in the like manner and to the ſame ends, there be ſome that pretend to be the true, nay, the only true Succeſſors of *Chriſt*, and his *Apoſtles*; who not finding in the Goſpel of *Chriſt* (as it is recorded by the *Evangeliſts*, and the *Apoſtles*) enough to ſerve their turns in order to their own Ambitious and Worldly Deſigns, and yet not daring openly to avow any other Goſpel for fear of St. *Paul's Anathema*, and of diſcovering themſelves to be *Antichriſt*, or at leaſt the *fore-runners* of *Antichriſt*; they make men believe that to be the Doctrine of *Chriſt* which indeed is not; partly by interpreting the *Apoſtolical Writings* in their own ſence, and partly by pretending *Apoſtolical Tradi-*

on

ons for that which cannot by any Interpretation be wreſted from the Apoſtolical Writings. And by this means in proceſs of time, they have made *Chriſt's Kingdom*, which, he himſelf tells us, *is not of this World*, to be of this World, and themſelves to be the Governours of it; and whoſoever will not be Perſwaded, muſt be Compell'd to believe it.

And thus the *Evangelical Dove* is made a prey to the *Roman Eagle*, whilſt *Maxims of Humane Policy* are taught for *Articles of Divine Faith*, and men are made to believe that God is the Author of ſuch *Doctrines*, and *Practices*, as are contrary, not only to the Truth of his *Word*, but to the Holineſs of his *Nature*. I mean ſuch *Doctrines* and *Practices*, as tend to the *Diſtraction* and *Deſtruction* of Kingdoms and States; as if *Chriſt* came not to *ſave* the World (as he ſaith he did) but to *deſtroy* it, which he ſaith he did not: or as if God were not the *Author of Peace*, as St. *Paul*, ſaith he is, but the *Author of Confuſion*, which St. *Paul* ſays he is not. But *let God be true and every Man a lyar*. And *God* (as St. *Paul* tells us in my Text) *is not the Author of Confuſion, but of Peace*.

In which Words we are to conſider,

1. The Occaſion,
2. The Senſe or Meaning,
3. The Intention or Scope,
4. The Uſe, or Uſes, which by Way of Application we are to make of them.

I. The Occaſion.

Firſt then, as to the *Occaſion* of theſe Words, it is impli-

implied in the firſt of them, in the Word, *For*; which, being a Note of connexion, muſt needs argue that the Words following have a relation to ſomething ſpoken of before, as the Occaſion of them. Now that which S. *Paul* had ſpoken of before, and whereunto this Saying of his doth relate, was the dangerous condition, which thoſe of that Church of *Corinth* were then in, by reaſon of certain *erroneous*, and *ſeditious Doctrines*, which under the notion of *Apoſtolical truths*, were cunningly infuſed into them, and credulouſly entertain'd by them, as appears by many Paſſages in *this*, and the *precedent* Chapters, eſpecially the *firſt*, where the *Apoſtle* tells them he had heard there were *Diviſions* amongſt them, ſome ſaying they were of *Paul*, others of *Cephas*, and others of *Chriſt*, and each of every ſort excluſively to all the reſt; thereby excommunicating one another, by appropriating *Chriſt* and his *Apoſtles*, and the *Apoſtolical* Doctrine unto themſelves: as if all that did not believe in *Chriſt*, juſt as they did, were no *Chriſtians*. Beſides, ſome of them to gain *Proſelytes* unto themſelves, and to increaſe and ſtrengthen their own *Party*, were content to diſpence in point of Practiſe with thoſe that were, or would be of their Faction, by permitting, or at leaſt by conniving at *Inceſtuous Marriages*, Cap. 5. 2. as likewiſe with the departing of *Wives* from their *Husbands*, and *à fortiori* with departing of *Husbands* from their *Wives*, Cap. 7. 10. and of *Servants* from their *Maſters*, Verſ. 20, and 21. of the ſame Cap. and by the ſame reaſon, of *Children* from their *Parents*, and of *Subjects* from their *Soveraigns* alſo. Now certainly the Teaching of ſuch *Doctrines* and

and the Allowing of ſuch *Practiſes* as theſe, muſt needs tend to the diſturbance of the publick *Peace*, and to the introducing of *Diſorder* and *Confuſion*, not into *Churches* only, but into *States* alſo.

Now this being then the State of *Corinth*, whereunto it was brought by ſuch as pretended to be *Apoſtles*, or to be as infallible at leaſt as the *Apoſtles* themſelves were; nay, and were believed to be ſo, by thoſe whom they had ſeduced, and who being ſeduced could not chuſe but adhere to their ſeducers, and to the Doctrines they were taught by them, until they were convinced of the falſhood of thoſe *Doctrines*, and conſequently of the fallibility of their *Teachers*, by ſome ſuch argument, as neither they, nor their teachers themſelves could diſprove, or deny: therefore St. *Paul* to prove thoſe *Doctrines* to be falſe, he proves them to be inconſiſtent with *Peace*, as evidently and undeniably appeared, by the *Diviſions* and *Factions* that were at that time in *Corinth*, and which St. *Paul* aſcribes to the aforeſaid Doctrines as the natural, neceſſary, and unavoidable Effects of them. And this being experimentally and apparently true, it follows of neceſſity that either thoſe *Doctrines* which cauſed thoſe *Factions*, and *Diviſions*, and *Confuſions*, were falſe, and conſequently that the Teachers of them were Seducers and *falſe Apoſtles*, which was that whereof St. *Paul* was to convince the *Corinthians*; or elſe, that ſuch Doctrines as are naturally and neceſſarily the cauſe of Contention and Confuſion are true Doctrines, which if either the Seducers were ſo Impudent as to *affirm*, or the Seduced ſo Fooliſh as to *believe*, they muſt needs *affirm*

and *believe* likewiſe, that ſuch Doctrines (notwithſtanding their being the cauſe of Faction and Confuſion) muſt be from God, or that God muſt be the Author of them; becauſe God is the Author of all Truth, and conſequently ſuch Doctrines, ſuppoſing them to be true, muſt needs be ſuppoſed to come from God, as the Author; and if as the Author, then as the Approver of them alſo. But this Suppoſition is impoſſible to be True, nay, it is blaſphemouſly Falſe, as being indeed a contradiction not only to the Word, or revealed Will of God, but even to Gods very Nature, and Eſſence it ſelf; as St. *Paul* demonſtratively proves by this *Theological Principle* or *Aphoriſm* in my Text, when he tells us, that *God is not the Author of Confuſion, but of Peace*; which being a *Theological Principle* (as I ſaid before) needs no Proof, it being ſelf-evident to any one that believes there is a *God*, and conſiders what God is, and what is meant either by *Confuſion*, or by *Peace*; and what it is to be *the Author* of the one, or of the other.

II. The Senſe or Meaning. And therefore having ſhewed you what was the *Occaſion* of theſe Words, I am now, in the *ſecond* place, to give you the plain *Senſe* and *Meaning* of them.

And here I do not intend to ingage my ſelf in a Diſcourſe either of *Confuſion* or of *Peace* in the general *Latitude* or *Extent* of the Words; and much leſs by way of *Common-place*, to give you a Catalogue of all the bleſſed Effects of the *one*, or of all the miſchievous Conſequences of the *other*; but only to tell you, *Firſt*, What is meant by the word *Confuſion*, and what is meant by the word *Peace* in the Text. *Secondly*, To ſhew

ſhew you how, and in what ſence, God may be ſaid to be the *Author* of the *one*, and not the *Author* of the *other*.

Firſt then by the word *Confuſion* here in this place, is meant the unſetling, diſordering, and diſturbing of any Society *Civil* or *Eccleſiaſtical*, whether it be by force or fraud, by Words or Actions: and conſequently by the word *Peace*, as it is here oppoſed to the word *Confuſion*, is meant neither the *Internal* peace of *Grace*, nor the *Eternal* peace of *Glory*, (though God be the Author, and the Author καὶ ἐξοχὴν, of peace in both theſe notions alſo) but only an *External* peace here in this World, as it is the εὐταξία or the εὐδαιμονία, the well-ordering or happy Conſtitution of a *Church* or *State*. And this is that which St. *Paul* in my Text means by *Confuſion* and *Peace*, when he ſaith, that God is not the Author of the *one*, and is the Author of the *other*.

But then, *Secondly*, If by *Peace* be meant Order and Settlement, and by *Confuſion* be meant Diſorder and Diſturbance in *Churches* and *States*, how can God be ſaid to be the Author of the *one* and not of the *other*? ſeeing there be ſo many places of Scripture, wherein the *putting down* as well as the *ſetting up*, the overturning and overthrowing as well as the ſupporting and eſtabliſhing, the diſſolution and deſolation as well as the ſafety and preſervation, and conſequently the *Confuſion*, as well as the *Peace* of *Kingdoms*, *Churches* and *States*, are in expreſs terms aſcribed unto God.

I anſwer, that the diſturbing and confounding of *Kingdoms*, *States*, and *Churches*, may be conſidered either as they are *mala Culpæ* or *mala Pœnæ*; that is,

either as they are Sins, or Puniſhments for Sin. Now as they are *mala Culpæ* or ſins in themſelves, ſo they are not from God, nor cannot be aſcribed to God, but to the inordinate or immoderate Paſſions of thoſe Men, who are either the Agents in them, or the Contrivers, Abetters and Fomenters of them, according to that of the Apoſtle, *From whence come Wars? from whence come fightings among you? come they not from hence, even from your Luſts?* Jam. 4. 1. And yet the ſame Diſorders, and Diſturbances, which, as they are *mala Culpæ*, or Evils of ſin, muſt be aſcribed unto Men; may, nay they muſt (as they are *mala Pœnæ*, or Puniſhments for ſin, be aſcribed unto God, as the vindicative effects of Divine Juſtice. But by *Confuſion* in my Text is meant only *malum Culpæ*, the Evil of ſin in thoſe that are the diſturbers of *Churches* and *States*; and therefore God cannot be ſaid to be the Author of it. The truth is, that neither God nor Man can properly be ſaid to be the *Author* of any thing, which is not done either immediately by himſelf, or mediately by his Command, or at leaſt either by his Advice and Direction, or by his Conſent and Approbation: but this cannot be ſaid of *Confuſion* in *Churches* or *States* in reference unto *God*: for neither is God the worker of it himſelf, neither doth he command, or adviſe, or direct, or allow of it: Whereas he is not only the *Author* but the *God of Peace*; and his Son is the *Prince of Peace*, and his Spirit is the *Spirit of Peace*, and his Goſpel is the *Goſpel of Peace*, and his Way is the *Way of Peace*: neither doth he command or teach any thing that is inconſiſtent with *Peace*, in any Kind or any Degree whatſoever.

And

And thus having ſhewed you the *Occaſion* and given you the *Sence* of theſe Words: I am now in the *third* place to ſpeak of the Apoſtles *Scope* or *Intention* in them, which was (as I conceive) to leave upon Record, for all Poſterity, a certain, a conſtant, and an infallible Κριτήριον or Touchſtone, whereby upon tryal, any man of an ordinary capacity might diſcover and diſcern many of thoſe *Doctrines* to be falſe, which the Apoſtle himſelf ſaw had been, and foreſaw would be, preached in the *Church* of *Chriſt*, and as a part of the *Goſpel* of *Chriſt* in the name of *Chriſt*, to the great Prejudice of *Humane Society*, to the great Offence and Danger of *Princes* and *Governours*, and to the great Scandal of *Chriſtianity* it ſelf: namely, ſuch Doctrines as muſt be (if they be believed and practiſed) deſtructive of the publick Peace and Safety of *Churches*, *States* and *Princes*. For although (as I ſaid before in my *firſt* particular) the *Occaſion* of theſe Words was the Diſorder, Faction, and Confuſion, which St. *Paul* ſaw with his own Eyes to be the Effects of ſuch ſeditious Doctrines as were brought into the Church and City of *Corinth* by the ſeducers of thoſe times: yet his *Scope* and *Intention* in theſe Words was not only to rectifie the Diſorder ond Confuſion which he ſaw *in that one Church* and *State* for the preſent; but likewiſe to prevent the ſame, or the like, or perhaps worſe Diſorders, which he foreſaw might be, and would be *in any Church* or *State*; nay, *in all Churches* and *States* for the future, if the like Doctrines, I mean any Doctrines inconſiſtent with the publick *Peace*, or tending to publick *Confuſion*, were any where elſe taught and believed to be

III.

The Scope or Intention.

be from God. And therefore the ſame Uſe, which St. *Paul* then made of this Κεῖνον this *Theological Principle* in my Text, may and ought to be made of it by us now, if there be the ſame Occaſion for it.

Becauſe God is as much the Author of *Peace*, and no more the Author of *Confuſion* now, than he was then. And if he be not the Author of *Confuſion*, he cannot be the Author of any Doctrine or Doctrines tending to Confuſion neither; which is St. *Paul*'s own Inference, and not mine. For indeed the very reaſon, why St. *Paul* tells the *Corinthians* that God was *not the Author of Confuſion, but of Peace*, was to convince them, that many of thoſe *Doctrines*, which were brought in among them, and pretended to be from God, were not from God indeed, becauſe they were inconſiſtent with *Peace*, or becauſe they tended to *Confuſion*: which could not have been a convincing Argument to them *then* as to that *particular*, if it were not *always* true in the *general*, that no Doctrine tending to *Confuſion*, or to the making of diſturbance either in *Church* or *State*, can truly be ſaid to be from God, or that God is the *Author of it*.

Obj. But was not (will you ſay) the preaching of the *Goſpel*, the preaching of *Chriſtianity* it ſelf, the Cauſe of great Commotions and Diſturbances in the World? and was it not in this reſpect that *Chriſt* himſelf ſaith that *he came to ſend a Sword, and not Peace?* and conſequently it ſeems that either *Chriſtian Religion* it ſelf muſt be falſe, or that ſome *Doctrines* that cauſe Diſturbance and Confuſion in the World may be true.

To

To this which is the only conſiderable *Objection* I can think of, I anſwer, that *Chriſtian Religion* was indeed the *Occaſion*, but not the *Cauſe* of thoſe Commotions and Diſturbances, which it did not make, but meet with in the World, when it was firſt publiſhed. For thoſe Commotions (whatſoever they were) did not proceed from mens *believing* and *obeying*, but from their *not believing* or their *not obeying* the Doctrines of the *Goſpel*. *Anſw.*

And as for the *Sword* that Chriſt ſaith he came to ſend into the World, it was a Sword of *paſſive* Perſecution, and not a Sword of *active* Invaſion, Reſiſtance or Rebellion: it was a *Sword* wherewith *Chriſtians* were to be ſlain themſelves, and not a Sword with which they were to deſtroy others: the *Weapons of their Warfare being Spiritual* to work upon the *Soul*, and not *Carnal* to make any impreſſion upon the *Body*: the Goſpel being not to be *planted* or *propagated* by force (as the *Turkiſh Alcoran* was) but by perſwading of it, and ſuffering for it; nor otherwiſe to be *defended* by Subjects againſt their Soveraigns, but by Prayers and Tears, and laying down their lives in defence of it. The truth is, *Chriſtian Religion* truly ſo called, is ſo far from being a Cauſe of Commotion or Diſturbance in Kingdoms and States; that were there any Kingdom or State in the World, where Chriſtian Religion were truly taught and truly practiſed, it would be impoſſible there ſhould be any Diſſention or Diſcord, any open *Rebellion*, or privy *Conſpiracy*, or any thing but Concord, Unity, and Peace in ſuch a State or Kingdom: becauſe all the *Articles of the Chriſtian faith*, and all

all the *Precepts of the Chriſtian practiſe*, tend unto Peace; — *Peace* betwixt man and man in general, by *forbidding* all men to Injure any man, or to Revenge themſelves if they be injured; by *commanding* every man to do good unto all men, and each of us to love one another as our own ſelves. *Peace* in private Families, by commanding *Husbands* to love their Wives, and *Wives* to obey their Husbands, *Parents* to provide for their Children, and *Children* to be dutiful unto their Parents, *Maſters* to be juſt and kind unto their Servants, and *Servants* to be faithful, and diligent, and obedient unto their Maſters. Laſtly, *Peace* in publick Societies, whether *Civil* or *Eccleſiaſtical*, nay, even in *Camps* and in *Armies* alſo; by teaching all *Superiors* to Govern juſtly, and prudently, and moderately, and carefully; and by teaching all *Inferiors* to Obey readily, willingly, and chearfully when their Superiors command things lawful, and never to reſiſt or rebel, but to ſuffer meekly, and patiently, when they cannot obey, that is, when their Superiors commands are abſolutely and evidently unlawful. Whence it is (as I told you before) that the Goſpel of *Chriſt* is called the *Goſpel of Peace*, not only becauſe it makes men to be at Peace with God, and at peace with themſelves, but at peace with one another, nay, with all the World, as much and as far at leaſt as the World will ſuffer them to be ſo. And conſequently whatſoever *Doctrine* there is, the *belief* and *practiſe* whereof doth cauſe diſorder, diſtraction and *confuſion*, that Doctrine though it be Preached in the Name of *Chriſt*, is no part of the *Goſpel of Chriſt*, or of *Chriſtian Religion* truly ſo called.

Which

Which truth being ſo evidently grounded upon this *Theological Principle*, or Κριτήριον, in my Text, and ſufficiently cleared from the only *Objection* that I can imagine may be made againſt it; let us proceed to make that *Uſe* which the Apoſtle intended we ſhould make of it: which is the *fourth and laſt* particular I propoſed unto you, and which I am now to ſpeak of by way of *Application* of all that hath been ſaid in General, to the occaſion of this preſent meeting of ours in Particular: which is with all humble and hearty Thankfulneſs unto God to commemorate that Great, and Wonderful, and almoſt Miraculous *Deliverance of* the then *King*, *Queen*, and *Prince*, and likewiſe of *all the Lords both Spiritual and Temporal*, together with all the *Repreſentatives* both of the *Clergy*, and of the *Laity*, from being all of them deſtroyed at once by the moſt horrid *Conſpiracy*, and moſt Diabolical deſign that ever was hatched in Hell, or attempted here on Earth: and yet was no more than what thoſe who were the *Contrivers* of it, and were to be the *Actors* in it, were prompted unto by ſome of the Doctrines of that *Religion* that was profeſſed by them, I mean, the Religion of the *Church of Rome*. Which that it may the better appear unto you, the *firſt* Uſe I will make of St. *Paul's* Κριτήριον or Touchſtone in my Text, ſhall be by way of *Diſcovery* or *Conviction*. IV. The Application.

For if according to the *Apoſtolical Aphoriſme* or *Canon* in my Text *God* be *not the Author of Confuſion, but of Peace*; then whatſoever *Church* it is that makes *God the Author of Confuſion*, by teaching ſuch Doctrines in his Name, as muſt, if they be believed and practiſed, of *Uſe* I.

neceſſity produce Confuſion; it is not an *Orthodox* or true believing *Church*, how confident ſoever it may pretend to be ſo; but a Company of *Hereticks* and *Schiſmaticks*, ſo far forth at leaſt as they teach and practice any ſuch Doctrines.

And ſuch indeed are all the ſeveral Sorts and *Sects of Diſſenters* from our Church at this time here in *England*, by what denomination ſoever they are called and diſtinguiſhed from us, and from one another: who though they differ in many things among themſelves, yet in theſe two Particulars they all agree; namely, *Firſt*, In maligning and oppoſing of the Church of *England*: and, *Secondly*, In teaching ſuch Doctrines as muſt neceſſarily, if they be believed and practiſed, produce Faction, and Sedition and *Confuſion* amongſt us, and conſequently muſt needs (if the teachers of them be not ſuppreſſed or reſtrained) be finally at one time or another deſtructive to the *Peace* and Safety of the preſent Government in the *State* as well as in the *Church*. Which though it might be verified (more or leſs) of all the ſeveral *Sects* that diſſent from us, yet becauſe the *Doctrines* tending to Sedition and Rebellion which are held by all the reſt, ſeem to be derived, and borrowed from thoſe of the *Church of Rome*, and becauſe the *Deliverance*, we this day Celebrate, was from a *Popiſh*, and not from a *Presbyterian* Conſpiracy (though ſome of the *Popiſh* Party did give it out it was) I ſhall at this time make uſe of the Touchſtone in the Text, in relation only to ſuch *Doctrines* and *Maxims* as are held and taught in the Church of *Rome*, and which muſt needs be

be falſe, if S. *Paul's* Touchſtone be true; becauſe by evident and neceſſary conſequence, they make God to be the *Author of Confuſion*, or at leaſt to be believed to be ſo.

Such are, *Firſt*, The Doctrine of the *Popes Supremacy*, and that not of Order or Precedency only, but of Authority and Juriſdiction alſo. Abſolute Authority and Univerſal Juriſdiction, * *ſupra univerſam Eccleſiam*, ſaith *Bellarmine*, over the *Univerſal Church*, that is, over all *Chriſtians*, and conſequently over all *Chriſtian States* as well as *Churches*, and over *Kings* as well as *Subjects*, and that not *in Spiritualibus* only, but *in Temporalibus* alſo. For *omne jus Regum à me pendet*, All the Right which Kings have is from me, ſaid Pope *Clement* the V. in the Council of *Vienna*. He ſhould have ſaid *Per me Reges regnant*, by me Kings reign; and then he had ſpoken like a *Rex Regum*; and *Dominus Dominantium*, a King of Kings, and Lord of Lords indeed, as ſome of his Flatterers * are not aſhamed to call him. In the mean time, whether this *Plenitudo Poteſtatis*, this fulneſs of Power in *Temporals* as well as in *Spirituals* be in the Pope *directly*, as *Baronius*, *Carerius* and all the *Caſuiſts* hold; or *indirectly* only, or in order to the enabling him for the better exerciſing of his ſpiritual juriſdiction, as *Bellarmine*, and with him the whole Tribe of *Jeſuits* ſay; it matters not: For which way ſoever it be held, this Doctrine is deſtructive to the *Soveraignty of Princes* over their own Subjects, and conſequently to the Obedience of Subjects to their own Soveraigns; than which, what can be more deſtructive to the Peace and Safety of a *State*? And yet this is that *Article of Faith*, which *Bellarmine*, in his

1.

* *Bell. de Concil.* lib. 2. c. 17.

* *Augut. Steuch. Anton. de Roſellis.*

chiding Letter to *Blackwell* the Arch-Prieſt here in *England*, calls the foundation of the *Catholick* (he ſhould have ſaid of the *Roman Catholick*) *Religion*: for ſo indeed it is.

2. And that you may ſee what they mean to build upon this Foundation, it is a *ſecond* Doctrine of theirs, That *Princes Excommunicated and Depoſed by the Pope may be not only deſerted, but deſtroyed by their Subjects*; as being not only abſolved from their *Allegiance*, but obliged to put the *Popes* Sentence in execution: which if they cannot do themſelves, they are to joyn with any foreign *Prince*, to whom the *Pope* ſhall pleaſe to give away the Kingdom (as he did this of *England* to *Lewis* of *France* in King *Johns* time) And againſt this Doctrine it was, that the *Oath of Allegiance* was ſpecially intended, and for this Doctrine ſake it was, that the *Pope* forbad all of his party to take the *Oath*.

Convenit inter omnes poſſe Pontif. Max. Hæreticos Principes jure deponere. Tort. Tort. p. 525.

3. Again to the end that *Subjects* might with the leſs ſcruple of Conſcience conſpire and rebel againſt their *Soveraigns*, when they ſhall be Excommunicated or declared *Hereticks* by the Pope; there is *another Doctrine* of the *Church of Rome*, which teacheth them, *That all power which Sovereign Princes have over their People, is derived from the People, and may be reſumed by the People*, to be transferred and collated upon any whom the *Supreme Paſtor* ſhall think fit to inveſt with it. This Doctrine was propoſed and defended in the Council of *Trent* by *Jacobus Laynez* the *Popes Divine* there emphatically ſo called, and one of the firſt *Jeſuits* who is herein followed by *Bellarmine*, and by all of the ſame Order. And this Doctrine ſaith King *James* (in

Quòd Reges poſſint deponi à Subditis ob multas cauſas. Bellar. de Pontif. lib. 5. c. 10. *Bellarm. in Recog.* lib. 3. *Quæſt. de Laicis.*

(in his *Admonition to Christian Princes*) is *fundamentum seditionis*, the ground or foundation of Sedition. *Regis Jacobi monitio ad Principes Christianos*, p. 333. 4.

Fourthly, That the *Pope* may always have a Party of his own and immediately depending upon himself in all States and Kingdoms; it is another of their Doctrines, that *all the Clergy in all places are exempted from all secular Jurisdiction in all Causes criminal, whether Civil or Ecclesiastick*: so that there is no *Prince* (whether he be of the *Roman Communion* or no) but he hath thousands that are born, and bred, and live under the Protection of his Laws, and that are not subject to him, but to a foreign Power: neither are they answerable to him for any Crime they do or may commit (whether *Murder*, *Felony*, or *Treason*) unless the *Pope* will give him leave to proceed against them; which *Exemption* (where it is allowed of) gives that *Clergy* courage to attempt any thing for the *Pope* against *Princes*; especially being unmarried, and consequently not having that obligation of Wife and Children upon them, which other men have, to indear them unto their Country, and their Country unto them, they are always the readier and the willinger to serve him upon whom wholly and only they depend. And in order to that end no doubt it was that both *Marriage* was forbidden, and *Exemption from Secular Jurisdiction* was granted unto the *Clergy*, though *Suarez* saith the latter of these is of *Divine Right*, and therefore is so general that it admits of no exception, and so certain that it cannot be denied, without contradicting an Article of Faith; I suppose he means the Article of the *Pope's Supremacy*, whereunto the Exemption of the *Clergy* from

from Secular Juriſdiction is ſubſervient in a very high degree, and no leſs dangerous to the ſafety of Kings and Princes, as King *James* obſerves in the aforeſaid Admonition.

5. Now if *Kings* or *States* to prevent the danger they are in by the aforeſaid *Doctrines* ſhall require an *Oath of Allegiance* from their Subjects upon ſuch Penalties, as that they dare not but take it, they have *another* Doctrine of *Equivocation*, or *Mental Reſervation*, whereby they are qualified to ſay or unſay, to ſwear or forſwear any thing that ſhall be or can be propoſed unto them, and thereby to avoid both the Penalty of refuſing, and the Conſcience of performing this or any other *Oath* whatſoever.

6. But if the *Oath* be ſo warily and ſo ſtrictly worded as that as it obligeth them to take God to witneſs, that they ſwear what they do ſwear without any *Equivocation* or *Mental Reſervation*, as they muſt if they take the *Oath of Allegiance*; then the *Gordian Knot* which cannot be untied muſt be cut aſunder by the omnipotent power of *Papal Diſpenſation*. For *Catholici omnes intelligunt* (ſaith *Tortus* or *Bellarminus larvatus*,) All Catholicks underſtand that it belongs to the Popes Power to Abſolve not only from Sins, but from Penances, from Cenſures, from Laws, and from Vows, and from Oaths too.

Tortura Torti. p. 11.

7. But what if it be part of the Oath to abjure the Popes Power of Diſpenſing with that Oath (as it is in the *Oath of Allegiance*) why! yet they have *another* Doctrine to help them at a dead lift, which is, that *Faith is not to be kept with Hereticks*; and it is not to be

ſuppoſed

ſuppoſed that *Catholick Princes* or *States* will tender ſuch an *Oath* as takes away one of the beſt flowers of the *Popes Triple Crown*; eſpecially if his Power of *Diſpenſing* be taken in the largeſt extent, or according to the practiſe of it; for ſo it reacheth to the ratifying or making void of any thing, not as it is right or wrong, lawful or unlawful, but as it is, or is not, for the Intereſt of him and of his See; though it be to the undoing of Families, the diſ-inheriting of right Heirs, or the embroyling of Kingdoms in long and bloody Wars, as hath been often done by his Diſpenſing with Inceſtuous Marriages, by his Legitimating unlawful Iſſues, and by his permitting cauſeleſs Divorces, which muſt needs produce endleſs Diſputes, and irreconcileable Quarrels in the World.

To theſe I will add but one Doctrine of theirs more, and that is, the *Indiſpenſable Obligation of their Prieſts to conceal* (I ſuppoſe they mean from all but the Pope) *whatſoever they hear in Confeſſion*, though it be the intended murder of Kings, or deſtruction of States, ſaith Cardinal *Tolet*; nay, the ruin of the World, ſaith *Henriques*; which is ſo horrid a Doctrine (as King *James* ſaith in his before-cited Admonition) that no *Prince* or *State* can be ſafe where there be ſuch *Confeſſors*; no, nor *Romiſh Catholick Princes* themſelves, as appears by *Henry* the III. and *Henry* the IV. of *France*, who would neither of them have been ſo barbarouſly murdred as they were, had not Fryar *Clement* and *Ravilliac*'s Confeſſors been of this opinion. So that of what Religion ſoever they be, neither *Princes* nor *States* can be ſecured from the danger of this Doctrine, much leſs 8.

leſs from the danger of this and all the former: of all which I may boldly ſay that if the Κριτήριον or touch-ſtone of my Text be true, every one of them is falſe, and conſequently none of them from the God of truth, who is the *Author of Peace*, but all and every one of them from him who is the Author of Lies, who is the ὁ πονηρὸς and the ὁ ἀπολλύων, the ſtirrer up of Strife, and the Author of Confuſion; whence it follows, that the *Church* that *teacheth* ſuch *Doctrines*, is ſo far from being the *Catholick*, that ſhe is not ſo much as an *Orthodox Church*; ſo far from being *the only true Church*, that ſhe is not ſo much as *a true Church*; I mean in a moral ſence, or ſo far at leaſt as ſhe teacheth ſuch Doctrines.

If it be replyed, that it is not the *Church of Rome* it ſelf, but only ſome particular *Doctors* of that Church that teach all or any of the aforeſaid ſeditious *Doctrines*. I anſwer, that theſe and the like *Doctrines* being publickly aſſerted, and maintained by the chief Pillars, and Profeſſors of that Church, and notoriouſly countenanced and abetted by the Head of that Church, and never condemned, cenſur'd, or diſclaimed by the Repreſentative Body of that Church; no, nor ſo much as taken notice of, as dangerous, or erroneous, by their *Index expurgatorius*, which cenſures all ſuch Authors and Opinions as that Church doth not approve of: we muſt needs conclude them to be the Doctrines of the *Church* it ſelf, and not of ſome of her particular *Doctors* and *Profeſſors* only; though ſome of her particular *Doctors* may Diſſent from ſome of them, which ſignifie little or nothing, as long as the Head

Head of the Church approves them, and as long as they all hold the *Pope* to be *Head of the Church*, whereunto the whole Body of the Church muſt ſubmit, and whereby it muſt be guided; and conſequently, they all hold he hath an *Univerſal Juriſdiction* over all Chriſtians, which is the πρῶτον ψεῦδος, the firſt of thoſe falſe ſeditious Doctrines, I before named; and whereunto all the reſt are but inſtrumental, and ſubſervient, as being at firſt invented, and ever ſince maintain'd in order either to the bringing in, or keeping up of that *grand Impoſture* (as one of our Biſhops calls it) I mean the pretended *Soveraignty of the Papacy* over all Chriſtendom, which whoſoever will acknowledg and ſubmit unto, he may hold either *pro* or *con* in almoſt all of the Controverted points beſides, and yet be a good *Catholick* as they call him, as appears by the offer made by *Paul* the IV. to Queen *Elizabeth*, which was this, That if ſhe would acknowledg his *Supremacy*, and take it as a Favour from him, or as an Indulgence granted by him and by his Authority, *Gratiam facturum Pontificem, ut ſacra hìc omnia hoc ipſo quo nunc ſunt apud nos modo procurari fas eſſet*; his Holineſs would graciouſly diſpence with our way of ſerving of God in all things pertaining to his Worſhip, in the very ſame manner as now we do: They are the words of Biſhop *Andrews* one of the Worthieſt, moſt Pious, and moſt Learned of my Predeceſſors, in his *Tortura Torti*, from whence (as he infers) it plainly appears that the μῆλον ἔριδος, that which is ſo much contended for by the *Pope*, and thoſe of his Party, is not that *Faith*, or any part of that *Faith*, which was once delivered to the Saints, as Saint

Jude tells us, and which he exhorts us earneſtly to contend for; but the exorbitant power of the *Papacy*, in and over the Church of *Chriſt*, for the gaining, or keeping, or recovering of which exorbitant power, that Ball of contention hath been kept up for ſo many hundreds of years in the Chriſtian World.

For what was that which made that great *Schiſm* in the Church, whereby the *Eaſtern* were, and ſtill are divided from the *Weſtern* Chriſtians? or what is that which now divides that of the *Roman*, from all other *Chriſtian* Churches, but the Popes affecting and aſſuming the title of *Univerſal Biſhop*, or of being *Head of the whole Church?* as if all other *Patriarks*, *Metropolitans*, and *Biſhops*, were all of them but his *Vicars*, and he *Chriſts*. Again, what made all thoſe quarrels firſt betwixt the *Popes*, and the *Senate*, and *People* of *Rome*, and afterwards betwixt the *Popes* and the *Roman Emperors*, as likewiſe betwixt the *Popes* and the *Kings of France*, and betwixt the *Popes* and the *Kings of England*, whereby all *Europe* was ſometime in one place, and ſometimes in another, diſtracted and divided, and torn in pieces, as it were, by Feuds, and Factions, and by cauſeleſs and cruel Wars, ſometimes the Father againſt the Son, and ſometimes the Son againſt the Father, and always Chriſtians againſt Chriſtians. What was the cauſe of all this, I ſay, but the extending of the Popes aforeſaid *Primacy* over the whole Chriſtian Church in ſpiritual things, to a *Supremacy* over the whole Chriſtian World, or over all Chriſtian Princes and States in the World? Laſtly, what was the cauſe of ſo many Conſpiracies againſt Queen *Elizabeth*, eſpecially

cially after her Excommunication by the Pope, which was ſeconded, firſt by a *Rebellion* in the North of *England*, and afterwards by the *Spaniſh Invaſion* in Eighty Eight? or, what was the cauſe of the *Gunpowder-Treaſon* it ſelf? was it not a zeal for the recovering and re-eſtabliſhing of the aforeſaid pretended power of the Pope here in *England*? I am ſure thoſe that were the Contrivers of it and Actors in it, (as many of them I mean as were brought to Tryal for it) did all and every one of them confeſs, that to be the only cauſe for what they did and for what they ſuffered, namely, their zeal for the *Catholick Religion* (as they call it) of which (as I told you before) their great Cardinal tells us the Popes Supremacy *eſt unum ex præcipuis fundamentis*, one of the chief foundations.

And as it was the reſtoring of the *Popes* pretended Authority that was the cauſe of that horrid *Conſpiracy*; ſo the Bull of *Clement* the VIII. (whereby a little before the *Queen* died, he had forbidden all of his Party here to ſuffer any but a *Roman Catholick* to ſucceed her) was the ground or warrant whereupon they undertook it; as appears by what *Catesby*, the chief of the Lay Conſpirators ſaid when ſome of his *Complices* ſeemed loth to proceed in it without the Popes expreſs command for it, or approbation of it: *To what end*, ſaid he, *ſhould we trouble his Holineſs any farther? was not the forbidding us to receive him warrant enough for the removing of him aſſoon and by what means ſoever it might be effected?* He might have added, that *Heretical Princes* might be Depoſed, or taken away by their Subjects, even before the ſentence of *Excommunication* or *Depoſition* be

pronounced by the *Pope* againſt them, as ſome of their *Doctors* hold; and therefore there was no reaſon they ſhould ſtand upon ſuch formalities in a matter of ſuch Importance; and which required a ſpeedy Execution. And thus no doubt they were reſolv'd in point of Conſcience by *Garnett*, the Provincial of the *Jeſuits*, at that time here in *England*, and the chief manager of this inhumane *Conſpiracy*, together with *Oldcorn*, and three more of the ſame Order, of all whom it was confeſſed by their Lay-*Complices* that they were not only privy to it, but Authors of it, I mean of the aforeſaid Conſpiracy, and that they were the aforeſaid *Jeſuits* that had encouraged them to undertake it; and had often by the Sacrament of *Penance* and the *Euchariſt* confirmed them in the Reſolution of it, as of a moſt *Catholick* and *meritorious* Undertaking; and now all Scruples being removed, and all danger of Diſcovery being as they thought prevented, by every mans having taken an *Oath of ſecrecy* and received the Sacrament upon it, the Eve of that day was come, which next to that of *Sodom* and *Gomorra* ſhould have been the blackeſt and diſmalleſt that ever the Sun beheld: The Eve of that Day which was to have been the *Doomſday* of this Kingdom: The Eve of that Day was come, I ſay, upon which aſſoon as the *King* and *Prince*, together with the *Queen* and her Ladies, and all the *Lords* and *Peers* were come into the *Houſe of Lords*, and the whole *Houſe of Commons* were come up into the ſame Room to attend his Majeſty, it was intended that fatal Blow ſhould have been given, of which what would have been the diſmal and direful Effects I had rather

rather leave it to every mans fancy to Imagin than vainly indeavour to Expreſs, what would have been indeed beyond all expreſſion. But thanks be to our great and good God, that it never arrived to any other exiſtence but what it had in their Intention, and what it hath now in our Imagination. For that ἔκδικον ὄμμα that ſevere all-ſeeing eye of the *Divine Juſtice* and *Providence*, which had lookt upon this *Embrio* of darkneſs from the firſt Conception until all its Limbs were formed, and framed, and faſhioned, did then, even then when it was come unto the Birth, and was ready to be brought forth, ſuddenly, and ſtrangely, and almoſt as much to ours as their amazement, diſcover it, or rather made it diſcover it ſelf; ſo that it was ſtopt, it was ſmother'd, it was ſtifled; it was buried in its own Vault, in that infernal Womb wherein it was conceived. And thus *the ſnare was broken and we were delivered* even before we knew the Danger we were in; which was ſo much the greater, becauſe we had no Apprehenſion at all of it, and conſequently no humane Poſſibility to prevent it, to avoid it, or to deliver our ſelves from it. And therefore what we could not poſſibly do for our ſelves, God himſelf was pleaſed at that time to do for us without any concurrence of our own towards it. But we muſt not think becauſe it was ſo once, it will be ſo always, or that we ſhall always be ſaved by Miracle, neither muſt we think becauſe we have eſcaped one, that therefore we are ſecure from all dangers, or that we may not poſſibly be in as great danger now, or at another time, as we were then, becauſe we do not ſee it, nor fear it, nor

nor ſuſpect it; for we did not ſee it, nor fear it, nor ſuſpect it then neither. But rather to conſider, *Whether* this *Barbarous Deſign* (conſidering who were the *Contrivers* of it, and *Actors* in it) were not the product of all, or ſome of thoſe *Doctrines* before ſpecified, and proved to be the Doctrines of thoſe that govern in the *Church of Rome*. Secondly, *Whether* the ſame Cauſes are not likely at ſome time or other to produce the ſame or the like Effects. Thirdly, *Whether* we may not in Conſcience, and ought not in Prudence, to prevent the ſowing and growing of ſuch *Tares* amongſt our *Wheat*, of ſuch Doctrines, in our Church. I preſume no man here doubts but we may and ought to do ſo; eſpecially conſidering that none of theſe Doctrines, which are and will be always the ſeeds of *Sedition*, *Conſpiracies* and *Rebellion*, are yet diſclaimed by any declaratory *Sentence* either of *Council* or of *Pope*, but are ſtill avowed and maintained by the prevailing party in that Church: nay, conſidering likewiſe that this horrible *Conſpiracy* it ſelf, the *Gunpowder-Treaſon*, hath not been as yet ever branded with any note of Infamy or Deteſtation ſet upon it by any publick Authority of the Church, but rather magnified and glorified by ſuffering *Garnett* and *Oldcorne* to be put into the *Martyrology*, or Catalogue of Martyrs by the *Jeſuits*, which they durſt not have done without the *Popes* knowledg, and conſent to it; which muſt argue his approbation of it, though he did not make a *Panegyrick Oration* in praiſe of theſe Traytors, as *Sixtus Quintus* did in praiſe of Fryar *Clement* for killing *Henry* the III. King of *France*, becauſe that was *proſperum ac fœlix*

fœlix ſcelus, and this was but an Attempt only: conſidering theſe things, I ſay, no man can blame us for looking as well as we can to our ſelves, and providing as well as we can for our own ſecurity from the danger of ſuch *Practiſes*, which we have experimentally found to be the fruit of ſuch *Doctrines*. And therefore from the *Uſe* of this Touchſtone by way of *Diſcovery*, I come to the *Uſe* we are to make of it by way of *Caution*.

Uſe II. And I will give it you in the words of our *Saviour* himſelf, Προσέχετε ἀπὸ τῶν ψευδοπροφητῶν, *Beware of falſe Prophets*, yea, though they come to you in *ſheeps cloathing*, as if they and none but they were of Chriſts fold, whereas inwardly and indeed (ſaith he) they are not only *Wolves*, but ravening Wolves, that is ſuch as intend to make a Prey of you, and *by their fruits* (ſaith he) *you ſhall know them*, that is, by their teaching ſuch Doctrines as are inconſiſtent with Peace, and tending to the ſtirring up of ſtrifes, and to the embroyling of Kingdoms and States in diſcord and diſſention, which is an Evidence that they are not of a Lamb-like, but of a Woolviſh nature and diſpoſition. Try them therefore by this Touchſtone in my Text which will never fail you. The name of *Catholick* may be falſly aſſumed, *Univerſal Tradition* may be falſly alledged, the *Churches Infallibility* may be falſly pretended, *Miracles* may be fraudulently forged, nay the *Word of God* it ſelf may be falſly interpreted, or fallaciouſly applied. But Gods nature can never be changed; he is the *God of Peace*, and therefore he is not nor ever was, nor ever can be the *Author of Confuſion*, nor of any *Doctrine* or *Practiſe* tending to Confuſion. *Mark therefore*,

therefore, ſaith *Paul*, *thoſe that cauſe Diviſions among you and avoid them.* Mark them, I ſay, and ſet ſome mark upon them that others may know them and avoid them alſo. For of this ſort, as this ſame Apoſtle tells us, 2 *Tim.* 3. 6. are *they who creep into Houſes and lead captive ſilly Women laden with ſins, and led away with divers luſts*; following herein the Devils method, beginning as he did with the weaker Veſſels, and hoping to have the ſame ſucceſs as he had in ſeducing our *Adams* by our *Eves*. And thus going up and down and *converting* (as they ſay) but *ſubverting* (as St. *Paul* ſaith, *Tit.* 1. 11.) *whole Houſes* they do by little and little undermine ſuch *Churches* and *States*, as are not built upon their own foundation.

And yet I will not ſay (as St. *Paul* ſaith, *Gal.* 5. 12.) ὄφελον καὶ ἀποκόπτονται οἱ ἀναστατοῦντες ὑμᾶς, *I would they were even cut off that trouble you*, or that cauſe troubles amongſt you: No, God is my witneſs before whom I ſtand, it is not their Perſecution, but our own Preſervation that I contend for. For as I differ from them in many other Opinions, ſo do I in this alſo, that *It is lawful to put men to death for any diſſent in opinion*, though it be in matters of Faith, ſo it be but in opinion only---And yet no doubt it is lawful by all *Laws Humane* and *Divine* for any *Society* of men to ſecure themſelves by all juſt means from thoſe whom they have juſt cauſe to be affraid of, and conſequently from thoſe who teach ſuch Doctrines as are practically deſtructive either to humane Society in general, or to this or that Society in particular. It behoves us therefore in order to our own preſervation, and in order to the

preſer-

preſervation of the preſent Government both in *Church* and *State* to take care, it may not be in their power to make any change or alteration in it. For when it is in their power they profeſs they are obliged to do it. And if you ask them why the *Primitive Chriſtians* did not depoſe or rebell againſt either the *Pagan* or *Arrian* Emperors (that is) againſt Infidel or Heretical Princes, *Bellarmines* anſwer is *quiâ deerant Vires*, becauſe they were not enow, or had not power enough to do it. And Pope *Gregory* the XIII. ſaith in excuſe of the *Engliſh Roman Catholicks* for not putting Pope *Pius* the V's. Bull in execution againſt Queen *Elizabeth*, by taking Arms againſt her, and depoſing of her, that they were not obliged *rebus ſic ſtantibus* in regard of their preſent weakneſs, but would be obliged ſo ſoon as they were able to do it: (*Tortura Torti*, pag. 5.) ſo that if either the *Cardinal*, or the *Pope* himſelf knew the Doctrine of their own Church, no *Proteſtant Prince* or *State* can, morally ſpeaking, be ſecure from the generality of their *Popiſh Subjects* any longer than they are in ſuch a condition, as that they cannot hurt them. From the generality, I ſay, of ſuch Subjects, I do not ſay from all of them; for I know there be many of them very worthy and loyal Perſons, and ſuch as have hazarded, and will hazard their lives again for the defence of their *King* and of their *Country* as frankly as any of our own Religion, when there ſhall be cauſe for it; at leaſt they are for the preſent reſolved to do ſo, and do unfeignedly believe themſelves when they profeſs they will do ſo; But *Dic mihi, cùm fueris tu Leo, qualis eris?* Alas! how do they know

whether they ſhall be always of the ſame mind or no? Are they not liable to temptation as well as other men, or can they tell how or to what degree, Ability, and Opportunity, and hope of Impunity, nay, of meriting a Crown of glory, together with the interpoſition of the Popes Authority, may work upon them? and therefore that neither they may be led into temptatiou nor we be expoſed to the danger which otherwiſe we may in reaſon expect from them; the beſt way for us and them too will be, at leaſt, to prevent the Growth and Increaſe of them, either in Number, or in Power; for if they increaſe in Number, they will inceaſe in Power; and if they increaſe in Power, they will increaſe in Number alſo: which becauſe it is already provided for by the *Kings* moſt gracious Anſwer to the Petition of both his Houſes of *Parliament* to that purpoſe, I ſhall no longer inſiſt upon it. Only I will add for the juſtifying of our *Laws* that are made againſt thoſe of the *Romiſh* Party, that if they ſeem ſomewhat to have a more watchful Eye, or to hold ſomewhat a ſtricter Hand over them, eſpecially in jealous times, they are to blame themſelves and not us for it; who could do no leſs than we have done to ſecure our ſelves from them: or rather indeed it is their own holy Father the *Pope*, whom both they and we are to complain of, for neceſſitating us to deal more hardly than otherwiſe we ſhould do with them, and them to ſuffer more than otherwiſe they ſhould do from us, by prohibiting them to take the *Oaths* either of *Supremacy* or *Allegiance*; and conſequently prohibiting them alſo either to acknowledg

knowledg the *Kings* Sovereign Power over all his own *Subjects* within his own Dominions, which is asserted in the *former*; or to secure the King of their indispensable Loyalty and Obedience which is promised in the *latter*. And truly why any *Roman Catholick* may not without any prejudice to his Conscience take either, or both of these *Oaths*, I see no other reason but the Popes prohibition only: I am sure that of the two which is most stuck at, I mean the *Oath of Supremacy*, was made, and given and taken by those of the *Romish* Religion in *Henry* the VIII's. time: but one of all the Bishops (which was *Fisher* Bishop of *Rochester*) refusing it; and some of the most eminent of them in parts, and place writing for it: namely, *Gardiner* Bishop of *Wincheſter* in his Book *De verâ obedientiâ*, prefaced by *Bonner* Bishop of *London*, who certainly were both of them as learned and as zealous *Roman Catholicks* as any were at that time of their Order in this Kingdom, I might add and as great persecutors of the *Protestants* and of the *Protestant Religion* also: so that unless the *Pope* hath made a new Article of Faith since, not only the *Oath of Allegiance*, but the *Oath of Supremacy* likewise, may be taken by any *Romanist* without Heresie.----But of this enough, and therefore I shall close up all with the third and last Use I shall make of this Κεφάλαιον at this time, *viz.*

With a *Thanksgiving* unto our good and most gracious God, *first* for delivering the *King*, the *Nobility*, and the *Gentry* that then were, and consequently the *King*, the *Nobility*, and the *Gentry* that now are, who *Use* III.

were then in the Loins of their Progenitors from that fatal Blow, which would at once have deſtroyed them, and all that were to come of them. *Secondly*, For delivering the whole *Nation* from the conſequences of that Blow, which would have been the enſlaving of us all, (the King himſelf not excepted) in our Perſons, in our Purſes, and in our Conſciences, to the Tyrannical Uſurpation of the Papacy: the intolerable yoak whereof our Anceſtors for ſo many hundreds of years did groan under. *Thirdly*, and *laſtly*, We are to thank God and to congratulate with one another for the Preſervation of our *Church*, from that, and all other Deſigns, and Conſpiracies againſt it: for the preſervation of our *Church* (I ſay) which as it was reformed at firſt (as the Temple of *Hieruſalem* was built, without noiſe of Axes and Hammers) without Tumult, Sedition, or Rebellion, being introduced by *Sovereign* Authority and Advice of the Reverend *Clergy*, and with the Conſent of the *Nobility* and *Repreſentative Body* of the whole Kingdom; ſo ſhe hath ever ſince continued a Mother of peace, and peaceable Children, whom ſhe trains up in humble Obedience to the *King*, and to the *Laws* without teaching them, or ſuffering them to teach any thing, whereby the People may be incouraged either to deſpiſe the one, or to reſiſt the other.

And this indeed is the peculiar Glory of the *Church of England*, that ſhe, and no other Church but ſhe, hath plainly and poſitively declared unto the World without *Iffs* or *Ands*, or any other clauſe, or words of exception or reſervation, that *It is not lawful for Subjects*

Subjects ſeverally, or joyntly, or in any capacity whatſoever, to take up Arms, or to joyn with any that do take up Arms, either offenſive or defenſive againſt Sovereign Authority, or without Commiſſion from Sovereign Authority, in any caſe, for any cauſe, or upon any either pretended or real provocation, and leaſt of all upon the account of Religion, becauſe that were *in terminis*, or in plain terms to contradict the *Apoſtle* in my Text, by making God the Author of *Confuſion* and not of *Peace*.

For what *Peace* could there be among Chriſtians, if it were lawful for *Subjects* to riſe up or to conſpire againſt their *Sovereigns* for defending or introducing of that which they call, or think to be the true *Religion*? For every man and Sect of men takes their own Religion to be the trueſt, otherwiſe they would not, nay, they could not in earneſt be of it themſelves; ſo that if it were lawful for *Subjects* to take Arms, or to attempt any thing againſt the *State*, or preſent Government, for that which they think to be the *true Religion*, all States and Kingdoms muſt needs be always embroyled in *Civil Wars*; becauſe there is no State or Kingdom but it hath ſome (I am ſure ours hath many) of ſeveral Religions in it; who might all as well as any take Arms upon this account againſt their Sovereign, who can be but of one Religion himſelf. If it be replied that though the *Sovereign* can be but of one Religion himſelf, yet there may be a *Toleration* given of all the reſt; I confeſs there may be ſo, but not without extreme hazard (as I humbly conceive) both to the *Religion* and *Perſon* of the *Sovereign*. 'Tis true, that all of all Religions cry out for *Liberty of Conſcience* until they

they themſelves are in poſſeſſion of the Sovereign power, and then they will give none to others: Witneſs the practiſe of thoſe of the *Church of Rome*, during Queen *Maries* Reign here in *England*, and at this day in *Spain* and *Italy*, and whereſoever elſe the *Romiſh Religion* is in its full power: Witneſs likewiſe the practiſe of the ſeveral *Sectaries* in their ſeveral turns of governing in the late Changes here at home, when there was none of them that did not, or would not have ſuppreſſed all other *Sects* but their own, as much as *they* did, if it had been in their power. The beſt and ſafeſt way therefore for *Prince*, *State* and *People*, is to profeſs, protect, cheriſh and allow of that *Religion*, and that only which allows of no riſing up againſt, or reſiſting *Sovereign Power*, no not in its own defence, nor upon any other account whatſoever; which moſt *Chriſtian*, and moſt *Orthodox* Profeſſion, if thoſe of the *Romiſh*, and thoſe of other Perſwaſions that live among us, but are not of us, would make as frankly, and as ingenuouſly and as ſincerely as we do, though it would not preſently reconcile all other Differences betwixt us and them, yet it would perhaps be enough to make us live peaceably, and charitably, and ſecurely together, without Fear or Jealouſie of one another, which would be a good ſtep towards an Accommodation of all other Controverſies betwixt us in time alſo: which is all that I have to ſay at this time upon this Occaſion: only let me intreat you all to joyn with me in this ſhort Prayer to God the Father.

That all who are called by the name of his Son, all Chriſtians may through the powerful inſpiration, and operation

ration of his Holy Spirit, be brought to agree in the Truth of his Holy Word, and to live together in Unity and Godly Love. That there be no more Hereſies, nor no more Schiſms, no more Sects, nor no more Factions, no more Controverſies, nor no more Scandals, nor no more Wars, Seditions, Conſpiracies, or Rebellions amongſt Chriſtians, but that all of us in our ſeveral Places and Stations may indeavour to adorn our holy Profeſſion by an holy Life and Converſation, that ſo we may be no longer Chriſtians in name only but in deed. Amen.

FINIS.

A

LETTER

Written by the

Bishop of Winchester

TO HER

HIGHNESS

THE

Dutchess of York

Some few Months before Her

DEATH.

LONDON:

Printed for *Joanna Brome*. 1683.

UNIVERSITY LIBRARY CAMBRIDGE

A LETTER TO HER Royal Highneſs FROM THE BISHOP of *WINTON*.

UNIVERSITY LIBRARY KING COLLECTION 1903 CAMBRIDGE

MADAM,

THE relation of *Friendſhip* I have had to *Your Father*, (before and ever ſince You were Born) and the relation of *Service* I have had unto *Your Self* (ever ſince it pleaſed God to advance you to your preſent *Grandeur*) will not ſuffer me to be altogether *Unconcerned* in any Thing, wherein I think *Your Highneſs* to be *Concerned* very much; eſpecially in regard of Your *Spiritual* and *Everlaſting* condition, in order whereunto I have had the honour to be more particularly Imployed by You for many Years together.

It was upon this Conſideration, *Madam*, that in *Lent* laſt I did preſume to acquaint *Your Highneſs* with a *Report* I had met with in many Places, and from ſeveral

Perſons, as well within as without the *Court*; and ſome of them neither *Yours*, nor *Your Fathers* Enemies, but rather very Well-wiſhers to You both, that *Your Highneſs* was generally ſuſpected to be at leaſt *wavering* in Your *Religion*, if not totally *alienated* in Your heart from it. And of this (beſides the Brags of ſome *Papiſts* to that purpoſe) they alledged, to make the *Suſpicion* the more probable, *two Reaſons*; of which the *One* was of Your abſenting your ſelf from two or three *Monthly Communions* together, which you never had done ſo much as once formerly: the *Other*, that in matters of *Difference* both of Opinion, and Practiſe betwixt *Us* and the *Papiſts*, Your *Highneſs* had often, and openly declared Your ſelf in favour of *Them* againſt *Us*. Which though You might do, (as I told them I ſuppoſe you did) by way of *Diſcourſe*, or for *Diſpute* ſake only; yet becauſe it was otherwiſe *Interpreted* and *Reported* by Thoſe that heard it, and otherwiſe *Believed* and *Talked* of by the Generality of the People, eſpecially in and about *London*, to the very great Grief and Trouble of thoſe that are indeed Your *Friends*, and to the very great Joy and Exultation of thoſe that may *ſeem* perhaps to be your *Friends*, but are indeed your *Mortal Enemies*, and have ſufficiently declared themſelves to be ſo: I could not chuſe but let *Your Highneſs* know what I had heard, that I might have from Your own mouth wherewithall to ſtop Theirs, that were ſo loudly and ſo maliciouſly opened againſt You. And ſo I thought I had, when *Your Highneſs* was pleaſed to tell me that the *Report* I ſpoke of (whomſoever it came from) was falſe and groundleſs.

leſs. For as to what was ſaid of your omitting to *Receive* twice or thrice, though it were true in point of *Fact*, yet the Conjecture that was made upon it had no Truth in it; for it was (as you ſaid) an Indiſpoſition in your *Body*, and not any Change in your *Mind*, that kept you from it, as it ſhall (ſaid you) appear by my receiving of it at *Eaſter*, which was then near, and when indeed you did receive it; adding, that you would not receive the *Sacrament*, no not ſo much as *once*, (though it were to ſave your life) if you were not of that *Church* wherein you did receive it; ſo that your receiving with us, (as you ſaid you would) the *Eaſter* following, after ſuch and ſo ſolemn a *Proteſtation* as You then made, I could deſire no greater an *Evidence* for mine own Satisfaction, nor no ſtronger a *Proof* to convince others, that *Your Highneſs* was ſtill the ſame you had been always formerly, in point of *Religion*; and conſequently, enough to ſilence all Diſcourſes, and to ſtifle all Reports, whereby Men were made to *believe* or *ſuſpect* otherwiſe of You. But when after all my Indeavours to that purpoſe I found I could not, I began to Conſider with *my ſelf*, and to Enquire of *others* that were your Friends, what might be the true Cauſe and Ground of the *continuance* and *increaſe* of thoſe falſe and malicious *Miſreports* of You, notwithſtanding your own open *Profeſſion* and *Practiſe* to the contrary. And we were all of that Opinion, that it was *partly* the Malice of your Enemies, and *partly* the Vanity and Artifice of the *Romiſh Party*, and *Romiſh Prieſts* themſelves.

And

And firſt the *Malice* of your *Enemies*, who thinking Themſelves to be in Danger, as long as You are Safe, and knowing how great an Intereſt you had gotten in the hearts of the People, by being ſo glorious a *Profeſſor* of the *Proteſtant Religion*, and withall ſo great an *Ornament* and *Support to it*, and conſequently that it would be a vain and deſperate *Attempt* to indeavour to ruin you in your *Perſon*, and in your *Relations*, before they had firſt ruin'd you in your *Reputation* and *Eſteem* with the People: they thought it their ſureſt and their readieſt *way*, and the ſafeſt too, to give it out, and to make it to be believed, that whatſoever you had been heretofore, or ſeemed to be now, you were indeed a *Papiſt*, or at leaſt *Popiſhly affected* in your heart, and would ſhortly declare your ſelf to be ſo. This they at firſt gave out in *Whiſpers*, but ſuch as were to be whiſper'd from Ear to Ear, until it became the *common Diſcourſe* in *Coffee* Houſes, and conſequently the *publick Talk* of all ſorts of People in all Places, thereby intending (as much as in them lay) to make as many as were either averſe from *Popery*, or afraid of it, (which I take to be 99 Parts in a hundred of the whole *Nation*) to be as much your *Enemies*, as they were themſelves, and conſequently not to care what ſhould be done to *You*, or become of *You*, or of *your Children*.

Thus the *Rebels* ſtole away the hearts of the People from the late *King of moſt bleſſed Memory*, who though he was ſo ſincere, and ſo zealous a *Profeſſor* and *Aſſertor* of the Religion of the *Church of England*, that at length he became a *Martyr* for it, yet his *Enemies* by raiſing

raiſing and ſpreading ſuch malicious and ſcandalous *Reports* againſt him, (as are now raiſed and diſperſed againſt You) made the credulous People believe, that he was indeed a *Papiſt* and intended to bring in *Popery*: upon which account only they raiſed many *Thouſands* againſt him, without whoſe aſſiſtance they could never have over-power'd and oppreſſed him as they did. And the Succeſs they had thereby againſt the *Father*, incouraged them to make uſe of the ſame Engine againſt his *Son*, by giving it out that the *KING* by living ſo long abroad in *Popiſh Countries* was ſo corrupted in his *Religion*, that if he were ſuffered to return he would bring home *Popery* along with him. So that with this groundleſs *Fear*, I found many very *Conſiderable* and very much *Intereſted* Perſons to be poſſeſt, when I was ſent into *England*, about two months before the *Kings* return; moſt of which time I ſpent in undeceiving all I met with, eſpecially the Heads and Leaders of the *Presbyterian* and *Independent* Parties (who ſeemed to be moſt afraid of ſuch a Change) by aſſuring them that thoſe *Miſreports* they had heard of the *KING* and his *Brothers*, were nothing elſe but the malicious Inventions of thoſe, that were either in *fact*, or in *conſent*, the Murderers of their *Father*, and conſequently irreconcileable and implacable Enemies unto his *Children*. For (ſaid I) to my certain Knowledg, who was almoſt always an Eye-witneſs of their actions, the *KING* and both his *Brothers* did not only by their *Profeſſion*, but by their *Practiſe* declare and teſtifie themſelves to be true Sons of the *Church of England* (even in the midſt of its Enemies) by coming *daily*

to

to our *Prayers*, and *weekly* to our *Sermons*, and *frequently* to our *Communnions*. Which I do not now Repeat by way of *Boaſting* of what I did; for though it was all I *could* do, yet perhaps it was leſs, I am ſure it was no more than I am *bound* to do. But I repeat this, and what I ſaid before of the late *King*, to let *your Highneſs* ſee, how dangerous a thing it is for any of the *Royal Family* to ſuffer themſelves to be traduced to the People by any ſuch Reports and Diſcourſes, as now are made of *your Highneſs*: which certainly ought not to be deſpiſed or neglected, but carefully and ſeriouſly to be enquir'd into, and ſpeedily to be ſuppreſſed by a ſevere and exemplary Puniſhment of the *Authors* and *Abettors* of them.

It was very well and wiſely done therefore of our preſent *Sovereign*, (remembring his *Fathers* Fate and the Cauſe of it) to paſs an *Act of Parliament* preſently after his coming home, whereby, the ſaying that the *King* is a *Papiſt* or that he indeavours to introduce *Popery*, is made puniſhable in a very high degree. And it is obſervable, that this *Act* wherein this *Clauſe* is, is in the *Title* of it called An *Act for the ſafety and preſervation of the KINGS Perſon and Government*; thereby implying that the raiſing and ſpreading of ſuch *Reports*, muſt needs be very *Dangerous*, and conſequently, thoſe that raiſe or ſpread them very *Criminal*; as being indeed the greateſt Enemies both of the *King* and *Kingdom*: which though it be moſt true, when ſuch *Reports* reflect immediately on the *KING* himſelf, yet is it in proportion true likewiſe, when any of the *Royal Family* are concerned in it. So that they are the *Kings*

and

and Kingdoms Enemies, as well as *Yours* and *your Huſbands*, and *your Childrens*, that were the *Authors*, and are the *Abettors* of what is ſo generally ſpoken, and ſeems to be ſo generally believed of *your Royal Highneſs* in this particular: to the divulging and the belief whereof, I do verily think that none have been more Active, nor ſo much Inſtrumental, as ſome of the *Popiſh Party*, and amongſt them eſpecially the *Popiſh Prieſts* themſelves, and that partly out of *Vanity*, and partly out of *Cunning*. For, as ſome of our *Secular Gallants* do, out of *Vanity* only, ſometimes boaſt of favours, they have received from ſuch or ſuch *Women* of known Honour and Virtue, though they never did nor ever durſt ſpeak ſo much as one word to any of Them to any ſuch purpoſe, ſo do many of the *Clergy Cavaliers* of the Church of *Rome*, as vainly vaunt, how Many and how Great *Proſelytes* they have made, and of how many conſiderable Perſons, of both Sexes, they have gained from *our* Church unto *theirs*; which though it be too true in too many, yet as to ſome whom they moſt boaſt of, and would fain have it believed they have prevail'd with, (as particularly and eſpecially with *your Royal Highneſs*) I am confident it is but a vain Brag; and yet I do not think 'tis done out of *Vanity* only, but out of *Artifice* and *Cunning* alſo; becauſe they have good Reaſon to hope, that if they can make it to be believed that they have gained but one ſuch *Proſelyte* as your *Highneſs*, it would be the moſt effectual Means, they can make uſe of, to perſwade Others; and conſequently the moſt compendious way they can take in Order to their main End.

In the mean time, it is another notable Effect of their *Fineneſs* and *Subtilty*, that when They themſelves have been the *Authors* and *Divulgers* of ſuch a malicious and ſcandalous *Report*, and done You all the Miſchief they can by it, than if they find Thoſe that are moſt Concerned in it, to be Alarum'd with it, and to reſent it with that indignation as ſo bold and ſo injurious a Practiſe ought indeed to be reſented withall; then, I ſay, the next thing they do, is by ſuch *Inſtruments* (as they never want about *great Perſons* upon ſuch Occaſions) to perſwade the Parties concerned in ſuch Reports, that all the Noiſe which they hear, and which ſeems to diſquiet them ſo much, is not from the howling of thoſe *Wolves*, but from the barking of their own *Dogs*, who being as they ſay more afraid than hurt, do by giving too ſoon and too loud a Warning of a *Danger* which they think to be greater and nearer than it is, rather increaſe than leſſen the Noiſe which was made before, and which perhaps would have ceaſed of it ſelf, if too much Notice had not been taken, as there was of it.

And ſuch an *Artifice* as this it was to inform your *Highneſs* (as ſome body did,) that this Clamour againſt *your Highneſs* from whomſoever it had its firſt *Riſe*, it had its *Growth* from ſome of *our Clergy*, and particularly from *Me* for One; as if I had given ſome body or other ſome Cauſe to Believe it, and conſequently made it more to be Suſpected and Spoken of by others than it was before; which, (as I then ſaid) I hope there is none knows me,

me, can think Me, (though I was never ſo *Wicked*) to be ſo very a *Fool*, as to believe of me. For what *End* could I have, (eſpecially having had ſuch, and ſo long a Relation to *your Highneſs*, as I had) what End (I ſay) could I have in making *your Highneſs* Believed, or Suſpected to be a *Papiſt*, unleſs it were to make my ſelf to be believed to be a *Papiſt* alſo? and conſequently to be an old arrant *Hypocrite*; ſeeing I always *did*, and *do*, and ever *ſhall*, by the Grace of God, profeſs the contrary, though I were to dye at a ſtak e for ſo doing. No, no, *Maddam*! it was neither I, nor, as I verily believe, any of *our Prieſts* or *Biſhops* but as I then ſaid, they were ſome of the *Prieſts* of the *Church of Rome*, that in all probability were both the *Authors* and *Abettors* of this *Scandal*: and that I was told no longer ago than the night before, by a *Perſon of Honour* and *Title*, that the very day before he came to me, he was told by a *Romiſh Prieſt*, that *your Highneſs* was already of their Church, and would very ſhortly declare your ſelf to be ſo: Whereunto my Reply was, that although I did believe his *Lordſhip*, yet I did not, and hoped he would not believe the *Prieſt* that told him ſo; becauſe your *Highneſs* had been pleaſed, (as I told his *Lordſhip*) not long before, to give me all the Aſſurance I could deſire to the contrary; with which Anſwer I ſent him away very well ſatisfied; for he came to *Chelſey* on purpoſe to enquire of me, whether what the *Prieſt* had newly and confidently told him were true or no. And ſo did many other of *Quality*,

both Men and Women, to whom I gave the ſame Anſwer, and (as I believe) with the ſame Succeſs. And this is All that either before or ſince I have done, to Increaſe or Countenance that *Report*.

But (as I preſently after informed *your Highneſs* your ſelf) it was not, nor ever would be in my power, nor in the power of any, or of all His or Your *Highneſſes* Friends or Servants, to ſilence this Report, or to hinder the People from giving credit to it; unleſs You your ſelf would appear in it, and would openly upon all occaſions declare your Deteſtation of it, as of a moſt falſe and a moſt malicious *Slander*, deviſed and deſigned by your *Enemies* to do you all the Miſchief they could, without any ground or colour of ground for it; and that you would not nor could not take them for your *Friends*, that either did believe it Themſelves, or that did not do what they could, that it might not be believed by Others. For without ſome ſuch *Proteſtation* as this (as I then told your *Highneſs*) ſeriouſly and ſeaſonably Made, and publickly and frequently Repeated by You to ſuch *Perſons of Quality* and *Intereſt* of both Sexes, as came daily to wait upon you, I did then, and do ſtill think it almoſt, if not altogether Impoſſible to undeceive the People, or to make them think otherwiſe than your *Enemies* by their malicious Reports have made them to think and to ſpeak of You: though nothing but your own *Declaration* of your ſelf to be as they report you (which I hope I ſhall never live to ſee or hear of) ſhall ever make me believe, that you

are

are not ſtill in point of *Religion* the ſame that you were when I had the Honour to wait upon you, and as I am ſure You was, when I left you.

And this I am the rather obliged to believe, becauſe the laſt time I had any diſcourſe with *your Highneſs* of things of this nature, you did ſeriouſly affirm to me, that never any Prieſt of the *Church of Rome* had ever been ſo bold as to enter into any diſcourſe of *Religion* with you. Whereupon when I humbly beſought *your Highneſs*, that if any of them ſhould be ſo bold at any time afterwards, and you ſhould think fit to hear what they could ſay either for their own Church, or againſt ours; your *Highneſs* would be pleaſed to command them to give it you in Writing, and that you would be pleaſed to ſhew me, or my Lord of *Oxford*, any ſuch Papers or Paper, they ſhould give you to conſider of, and to reply to: the which becauſe You were pleaſed to promiſe me you would do and have never as yet done, (not to *Me* I am ſure, nor to *Him* neither, for ought I know) I cannot believe that any thing of that Kind hath been as yet ſaid to you, at leaſt not ſo, as to make any Impreſſion in you; and much leſs to gain an abſolute Belief from you, that there is no Salvation to be had but in the *Church of Rome* only; and conſequently, that if ever you mean to be ſaved, you muſt of neceſſity quit *our* Communion, and embrace *theirs*. I cannot believe (I ſay) that any ſuch *Diſcourſe* hath as yet been made to You, becauſe whatſoever is talked of by

Others,

Others, you have ſaid nothing *Your ſelf* to me of it, which certainly you would have done, (if there had been any ſuch thing) having obliged your ſelf by promiſe to do ſo, and having had ſeveral opportunities of ſo doing; eſpecially, when you were pleaſed to honour my Houſe at *Farnham* with your Preſence for ſo many days together, where and when I did indeed expect You would have ſaid ſomething to me (according to your promiſe, if there had been cauſe for it) which becauſe You did not I concluded there had been no ſuch Attempt made; and conſequently, that there was no need of my ſaying any thing to You of it, as if I had doubted whether you had or would keep your Word with me or no.

And truly, *Madam*, though you had made no ſuch *Promiſe*; I cannot but believe that if there had any ſuch *Scruple* been ſuggeſted to you from *within*, or offer'd to you from *without*, you would have acquainted Me or the Biſhop of *Oxford*, or ſome other of our Order or Profeſſion with it; eſpecially if the Doubts or Scruples had been ſuch as you your ſelf could not anſwer. For though God hath given you an extraordinary good *Underſtanding*, yet I am ſure, you have not ſo high an Opinion of it, as to conclude, that what You cannot anſwer, is therefore Unanſwerable in it ſelf; or that it cannot be anſwered by Others; and particularly by ſome of Thoſe, whoſe *Profeſſion* and *Office* it is to defend the truth of our Church, and the truth of the Doctrine

that

that is profeſs'd in it, and taught by it, againſt all Objections that either by *Schiſmaticks* or *Hereticks* are or can be made againſt it; ſo that whatſoever they may whiſper in Corners to the contrary, neither the One, nor the Other ſhall ever be able to prove either that there is any thing neceſſary to be *Believed* or *Practiſed* for the ſaving of Souls which we do not teach, or that we do teach any thing that is deſtructive of *Salvation*, or which is inconſiſtent with the *Rule of Faith*, or *Holineſs of life*, which was at firſt delivered by *Chriſt* and his *Apoſtles*, and which was afterwards held by the *Primitive Fathers*, in the moſt antient and pureſt Ages of the Church; and conſequently whatſoever may be pretended, it never was nor ever can be proved, but that thoſe that live and die in the *Profeſſion* and *Practiſe* of what they are taught to *believe* and to *do* by the Doctrine of *our Church*, muſt needs be in the right way, which will undoubtedly bring them into Heaven, if they continue in it. Whereas if they depart from it, they will be in a worſe, and in a much more dangerous condition than if they had never known it.

For although we have ſo much *Charity* for ſome that live and die in the *Belief* and *Practiſe* of ſome *erroneous Doctrines*, and of ſome *ſuperſtitious Uſances* of the *Church of Rome*; ſuppoſing they do both the one and the other out of *invincible Ignorance*, and ſuppoſing too, that they would have continued in neither, if they had known or ſuſpected them to be either

either *erroneous* or *ſuperſtitious*, and conſequently, that they had a preparation of mind to *believe*, and *practiſe* the contrary Truths, if they had been made known unto them, or rather, if they had not by their falſe Teachers been concealed from them: and laſtly ſuppoſing likewiſe that as they do *actually* and *particularly* repent of all their *known ſins*, ſo they do *habitually*, or *in the general*, truly and heartily repent before they die of all their *unknown ſins* alſo; or of all ſuch ſins of theirs which God knows to be ſins, though they do not; and conſequently of all ſuch *Errors* and *Superſtitions* as they have ignorantly, and unwittingly, and unwillingly lived in. Although (I ſay) we have ſo much *Charity* for ſome that have been born, and lived, and died in the Communion of the *Church of Rome* as not to deny upon the aforeſaid *Suppoſitions* they may be Saved, not **Becauſe** but **Notwithſtanding** they lived and died in that *Church*, which is no more than the Charity which upon the ſame ſuppoſition they have for Us, or for thoſe that live and die in *our Church*: yet we have not, nor cannot have the ſame *Hope* for *Thoſe* that having been born and bred in *our Church*, and ſufficiently inſtructed in the Doctrine of it, do afterwards become *Apoſtates* from it, and *Proſelytes* to the *Church of Rome*, by renouncing thoſe Truths they were taught in the *one*, and profeſſing thoſe Falſities they are made to believe in the *other*: for whom (as I ſaid) we have no ſuch *hope*, nor indeed any hope at all, unleſs they do actually and parti-

particularly repent of *this*, as well as of all other their known ſins, and withall do teſtifie the truth of that Repentance, by returning again unto Us, and by asking *God* and the *Church* forgiveneſs for the *Sin* againſt the *one*, and for their *Scandal* againſt the *other*, by their going away from us, if at leaſt they have time and opportunity to do it.

Now this (according to our Opinion) being the difference betwixt thoſe that after the Knowledg and Profeſſion of the Truth, go out from us, and thoſe that would (if they had known the Truth) have come over to us, it is manifeſt, that the *Charity* we have for the *One*, though they live and die in the *Church of Rome*, can be no Motive or Incouragement for thoſe of the *Other* ſort to go and live and die there, no more than it can be any Warrant for a Sound man to go out of an healthy Air and to put himſelf in a *Peſt-Houſe*, becauſe there is a poſſibility that ſome one or a few may not die of the Plague there. And this I do the rather Obſerve, becauſe, from this Charitable opinion of ours towards ſome that live and die in their *Communion*, they uſually infer (as a *Preface* to their making of *Proſelytes*) that it muſt needs be much better and ſafer to be of *Their* Religion than of *Ours*, becauſe we confeſs that ſome may be *ſaved* among *Them*, but they do all deny there is any *Salvation* to be had amongſt *Us*. Which if it were true (as indeed it is not) they might from thence infer as well that it was better and ſafer to be of the *Donatiſts* Religion,

who were condemned Hereticks, than of St. *Auſtins*; becauſe that St. *Auſtin* did not deny that ſome among the *Donatiſts* could be ſaved, but all the *Donatiſts* did affirm that none that were not, or would not be *Donatiſts* could be ſaved. Which is the very ſame which the *Papiſts* affirm now, and for which they may as well now, as the *Donatiſts* were then, be called *Hereticks*; for excluding as the *Donatiſts* did all Chriſtians but themſelves, from a capacity or poſſibility of Salvation. And why ſo? becauſe (forſooth ſay they) there is no *Salvation* to be had but in the *Catholick Church*, and no man is of the *Catholick Church*, that is not of *their Church*, becauſe the *Catholick Church* is *their Church*, and *their Church* is the *Catholick Church*; and conſequently he that is not of the *one*, cannot be of the *other*. And did not the *Donatiſts* ſay ſo too? and was it not for their ſo ſaying that they were pronounced *Hereticks*? And the *Papiſts* may as well and truly ſay, that becauſe a man is not in *Rome*, therefore he is not in *Italy*, or becauſe he is not in *London*, therefore he is not in *England*; or becauſe this Part is not a part of that part, therefore it is not a part of the whole, which they muſt prove before they can make any reaſonable man to believe that we cannot be *Catholicks*, unleſs we will be *Papiſts*, or which is all one that we cannot be *Catholicks* at all, unleſs we be *Roman Catholicks*. Whereas we may be *Catholicks*, by ſubmitting to the Laws of *Chriſt* contained in the Goſpel: but we cannot be *Roman Catholicks*, but by ſubmitting to the dictates of the *Pope*, and *Popiſh Councils*, particularly to that of *Trent* and

and the *Canons* thereof, which are many of them nothing akin to the *Canon of the Scriptures*. For *drink ye all of this*, ſaith the *Canon of Scripture*, but you ſhall not drink *all* of this, ſaith the *Pope* and the *Canons* of his *Councils*; and many other the like Inſtances might be given in other particulars.

But I forget what I was a doing, which was not to *diſpute* with Them, 'till they have been ſo bold as to diſpute with You; which I do all this while ſuppoſe they have not done yet, becauſe you have not yet given me any Intimation of it, as I am confident you would have done, not only becauſe you *promis'd* you would do ſo, but becauſe without any ſuch *Promiſe*, I preſume you would have thought your ſelf concerned in point of *Prudence* and *Equity*, and of *Conſcience* too, having heard what could be ſaid by any of them to draw you from us, to hear likewiſe what could be ſaid by ſome of Us to keep you with us. For to conclude in favour of *one* ſide without hearing of the *other*, is that which cannot be done either in *Equity* or *Conſcience*, though you your ſelf were to gain never ſo much by it; whereas in this Caſe if you ſhould be ſurpris'd and prevail'd with for want of *Advice* or *Counſel* to aſſiſt you, you might have loſt Your ſelf and your ſoul by it, which is too pretious a Gage, and coſt too dear to be hazarded upon Confidence of Ones ſtrength againſt ſuch ſubtil *Gameſters* as they are. For what would this have been, but to do as *Eve* did? who entring alone into the Liſts with the *Serpent* (though ſhe had much more wit than any of her Sex had ſince) ſhe

was eaſily foyl'd by him, as perhaps ſhe would not have been, if it had not been in the abſence of her Huſband; or if after ſhe had heard what the *Tempter* could ſay, ſhe had afterwards ſuſpended, at leaſt her Conſent to the *Temptation* until ſhe had acquainted the Man with it, and heard what he was able to reply to it; which becauſe (relying too much upon her own Judgment) ſhe neglected to do, we ſee ſhe did as much as in her lay to undo, and undo for ever, *Herſelf* and *her Husband*, and all their *Poſterity* by the loſs of all their Enjoyments for the *preſent*, and of all their Hopes for the *future* alſo. So raſh and ſo dangerous a thing it is for any (though of never ſo great a Sufficiency) to rely too much upon Themſelves, when all their Concerns, both here and hereafter, are at ſtake.

And therefore, *Madam*! being ſo prudent a Perſon as you are, and knowing ſo well as you do, how great a Hazard you may run of loſing all that is or ought to be Dear to you, I am confident, you will not ſuffer your ſelf to be diſputed out of your *Religion* for want of *Seconds* to aſſiſt you; which ſeeing you have not hitherto called for, or made uſe of, I do and muſt conclude, that hitherto the *Adverſaries* of our *Church* have either made no Attempt upon you, or have been rejected with Indignation by you. And in this Belief I am more and more confirm'd, becauſe you ſtill joyn with us in the *Prayers* of the *Church*, as having them daily by your own Appointment read in your Hearing; which though *Some* perhaps of thoſe that are departed from Us with their hearts, may be content to do, in Compliance with

with ſome preſent worldly Intereſt; yet I am ſure you cannot diſpenſe with Your ſelf, nor ſuffer Your ſelf to be diſpenſed with, in any thing of that nature; becauſe *You* your ſelf have told me more than once (even ſince this falſe Report hath been rais'd of you) that you would not do any thing, whereby you might ſeem to be of a *Church*, or of a *Religion* which you are not of indeed; no, not for any worldly Conſideration whatſoever. Which is indeed ſuch an *Ingenuity* as well becomes a *Chriſtian*, eſpecially of your *Quality*, and ſuch as gives me an Aſſurance, that You are ſtill *ours*; and that you will continue to be ſo, until You your ſelf by your Words or Actions ſhall declare the contrary, which I hope you never will, and I am ſure you never can with a good Conſcience, until you have heard and conſidered all that can be ſaid on both ſides. For if you ſhould do otherwiſe, it will never be believed that your leaving of Our *Church*, wherein you were born and bred, to go to Theirs, is only out of love to the *Truth*; or becauſe They, and not We, are in the right way to Heaven; (of which without hearing what we can ſay for our way, and againſt theirs, it is Impoſſible for you to judg) but from ſome Byas or by-end from without; which becauſe I know it is that which you abhor ſhould be thought or ſuſpected of you, therefore (as I have ſaid often already) I will not, I cannot believe that you have or ever will make any ſuch *Change* without hearing what we have to ſay againſt it; becauſe that will be not only an *Argument*, but almoſt an *Evidence* that it is from ſome other Motive, rather than

than Conſcience, becauſe you did not all you *might* and *ought* in Conſcience to have done, to warrant ſuch a *Change* before you made it; nay, it will be thought, and ſaid, You were afraid to hear what could be ſaid againſt it, leſt thereby you might be diverted from it.

Which *Conſideration* I beſeech you to remember, whenſoever there ſhall be, (though I hope there never will be) an Occaſion to make uſe of it; yet, in the mean time, there being no ſuch Change made yet, I humbly conceive *your Highneſs* is obliged in *Conſcience* as well as in *Prudence* to make ſome ſuch *Declaration* (as I before ſpake of) namely, that the *Report* of your being changed in your Religion, or that you intend any ſuch Change, or are at all inclined to it, is *falſe* and *ſcandalous*, deviſed and publiſhed by the Malice of your *Enemies* to make you loſe the Affections of your *Friends*, and to alienate the hearts of the People from *You* and from your *Children*: and that You never did nor ever will give any juſt Cauſe for the Belief of it.

Some ſuch *Declaration* I ſay (as I humbly conceive) *your Highneſs* is bound in *conſcience*, as well as in *prudence* to make, to prevent ſuch Miſchiefs as the Continuance and Increaſe and Belief of this odious Report may bring upon *You*, and upon all your *Relations*. For although that be true which you are wont to ſay, that no worldly, either *Advantage* or *Prejudice*, is to be conſidered, when the gaining of the One, or the avoiding of the Other comes into Competition with the hazarding or ſecuring of our ſpiritual and everlaſting Intereſt, of our Souls; and conſequently, that if you were

Convin-

Convinced there were no *Salvation* to be had but in the *Church of Rome*, no Conſideration either of *Loſs* or of *Danger* here in this World you might incur by it, ſhould keep you from it: yet when you are not ſo perſwaded, (as I do all this while ſuppoſe You are not) then I hope you may and ought to do what you can, that you may not be believed or ſuſpected to be ſo; eſpecially if it being but ſuſpected to be ſo, will in all probability do You and all that relate to you every whit as much Miſchief in the opinion of the People, as if really and indeed you were ſo; wherewithall I will conclude. Humbly begging your *Highneſſes* pardon, for having given you ſo great a Trouble, the rather becauſe conſidering my great *Age*, and conſequently my near approaching *End*, it may be (beſides my *Prayers*) the *laſt Service* that may or can be done by

Jan. 24. 1670.

Your Highneſſes

moſt humble and faithful Servant,

GEOR. WINTON.

FINIS.

Convinced there were no Salvation to be had but in the
Church of Rome, no Consideration either of Life or of
Things here in this World you might incur by it, should
keep you from it: yet when you are not so perswaded,
(as I do all this while suppose You are not) then I
[illegible] you may and ought to do what you can, that you
[illegible] being but suspected to be so: especially
do You and all those related to you every where as much
[illegible] in the opinion of the People, as it really and
[illegible] ably begging your Pardon, for having
given you so great a Trouble, the rather because con-
sidering my great Age, and consequently my near ap-
proaching End, it may be (besides my Prayers) the
[illegible] Service may or can be done by

Jan. 24. 1670.

Your Highnesses

Most humble and faithful Servant,

GEOR. WINTON.

FINIS.

THREE
LETTERS.

THE FIRST

Written by a Regular Prieſt of the

Church of Rome,

To the Biſhop of WINTON.

THE SECOND

Written by the ſame Prieſt to the Biſhop of *Ferns* in *Ireland*, by way of Apology for Dr. *Sall.*

The Third is the

Biſhop of Wintons Anſwer

To the ſaid PRIEST;

Wherein he gives his Judgment of the Second Letter as the Prieſt deſired him.

LONDON, Printed by *J. Wallis*, for *Joanna Brome*, at the Gun in St. *Pauls* Church-Yard, 1682.

THREE

LETTERS

Church of Rome

To the Right Rev. Dr. HUNTER,

Bishop of Waterford and Lismore.

Accession

No.

A

LETTER

Written to the Biſhop of *WINTON*,

BY A

ROMAN PRIEST;

And ſent to him with the Letter that follows, written by the ſame Prieſt, *to a* Roman Biſhop, *to deſire the Biſhop of* Winton, *to give him his Judgment of it, and the matter contained in it.*

My Lord,

I Am comforted by your *Lordſhips* deſire of a Copie of thoſe Papers I ſent you; becauſe I take that for a ſure Argument of your Approbation of them. Would your *Lordſhip* would have been likewiſe pleaſed to ſend me your Judgment of that other which I left with you (my laſt Letter to *Ferns* I mean) *wherein I ſaid what I thought was true, and became me to ſay to a Man that deſired my Judgment.* I intend to ſay more, and even to *deſcend to particulars*, if he give me occaſion by any anſwer of his, to the Heads of that Letter; which I ſtill expect. *And ſuch a fair occaſion I heartily deſire to declare my Conſcience.*

I muſt confeſs your *Lordſhips Argument*, which you were pleaſed ſome three years ſince, to give me in writing *againſt Tranſubſtantiation*, made me ſtudy with more earneſtneſs, and coolneſs, and indifferency, not only that, but all other points alſo, than I had perhaps before in all my Life. The effect of which upon my Soul is, *That I think, the Roman Churches Anathematizing other Churches on the ſole Account of the late controverted Doctrines, cannot be excuſed from rending the Catholick Church of Chriſt.* Beſides that *I cannot deny That ſeveral of her Definitions ſeem to me to be falſe, and without ſufficient ground either in Scripture or Tradition.* And yet after all I cannot be ſatisfied, nor convinc'd, that I am bound to renounce her Communion, what ever I think either *of the*

Lawfulneſs, or tye of Conſcience on me to approve the Communion of the Church of England, in order to ſuch as truly underſtand where all the ſtreſs lies, and the true and full Grounds of both ſides. *Of this I am certain (as far as I can remember,) it hath been the Judgment of the* Eighth *General Council, That no Pretence of* Hereſy *warrants Inferiors to quit the* Communion *of their Church, or* Subjection *to their even Eccleſiaſtical Superiors, untill by a due courſe they be convinced and declared to be* Hereticks, *or* Schiſmaticks, *or* Outlaws. Whence it muſt follow, that I may at leaſt remain Conſcientiouſly in that *Communion*, wherein *I* am perſwaded there are ſome greivous Errors taught. But on the other ſide it doth not follow that the Church of *England* is, or was guilty of the *Schiſm*; She broke no *Communion* with, nor owed any *Subjection* to the Church of *Rome*. Thoſe that were of her *Communion*, and owned her *Juriſdiction*, when the *Reformation* began under King *Edward*, and was reſtored or continued under Queen *Elizabeth*, and yet broke looſe from her upon ſuch *frivolous pretences as are and were thoſe of her diſſenting Children the Puritans* (to ſay nothing of the *Separatiſts*) ought to be concerned in that *Canon* of the aforeſaid *Council*, if they did care for any *Canons* or *Councils*.

But I treſpaſs, *my Lord*, on your Patience, by dilating farther than is neceſſary on ſuch a Subject. It remains that I crave your Bleſſing, and kiſs your hands with all Veneration.

London, this 14th. of *July*. 1676.

My Lord

Your Lordſhips

ever Devoted Servant.

THE COPPY OF A LETTER

Written by a Regular Prieſt

OF THE

CHURCH of ROME,

To the Biſhop of *FERNS* in *IRELAND*:

By way of Apology for Doctor Sall *the Jeſuit's leaving the Communion of the Church of* Rome, *and joyning himſelf in Communion with the Church of* England.

SIR,

THE utmoſt I meant by the *Queries* in my laſt, was to let you underſtand that I have a better opinion of the *Church of England*, then you ſeem to have; particularly as to her Doctrine of *Repentance*, Miniſtry of *Reconciliation*, Power of *Holy Orders*, and *Chriſtian Preaching* of good Life. But ſo I have much a greater Veneration for the *Greek Churches* in general then *Bellarmin* had; if his own Works tell us truly what his inward Sentiments were. And therefore I hope, that upon due reflection you will not think thoſe few *Queries* of mine, ſhould either ſtrike you into amazement, as you ſay they did, or ſo much as give you the leaſt cauſe to fear. But concerning them, to explain my ſelf a little more fully, ſince you deſire I ſhould; be pleaſed to obſerve two things, although but ſuch things as are but only a part of my more general and remote grounds.

The *Firſt* is, that I hold it an obligation of Conſcience on me, neither on the one ſide to *maintain* (for *believe I* cannot if *I* would never

ſo

ſo fain) any *principles*, or *practices*, which according to the inward conviction of my own proper Soul appear to me *erroneous* and *wicked*: nor on the other hand, to *condemn* any of thoſe, either *Doctrines* or *Rites*, or *Powers*, which after full examination of them and of all objections brought againſt them, do nevertheleſs to my underſtanding, appear ſtill very *Orthodox*, *Lawful*, and *Firm*.

Dolefull Fall pag. 233

The *Second* is, that *I* am far enough from approving that known Rule in our *Canon* Law, *Qui dubitat de fide infidelis eſt*, if taken in the common Sence, in which our *Canoniſts* and *Theologians* make uſe of it. We know that they extend it to the caſe of doubting of any one *Tenet*, whatſoever, *practicall* or *ſpeculative*, defined in the *Roman Church*, let the cauſe of ſuch doubting appear to be never ſo great. Which Sence and Doctrine of theirs, I, for my part, hold to be very falſe, and very unreaſonable, and very improbable too, as to any intrinſick probability in it. Nor can *I* imagine, how ſuch men could, in point of Reaſon, go about to unhinge either a *Chriſtian Heretick*, or an *Antichriſtian Jew*, or a *Mahometan*, or even a *Heathen Idolater*, from the principles of the *falſe Religion* in which any of them were educated. Amongſt all *Religions* in the World there are People as firmly adhering to the principles of each *Religion*, as any *Roman Catholick* does to his own, for ought we know to the contrary: and if ſuch firm Adherers will return to a *Roman Miſſionary* but his own foreſaid *Rule*, when firſt he attacks him, where will he be then? But if this be not to explain my ſelf or my *Queries* ſufficiently, at leaſt ſo far, as to free you from amazement and drive away your fear; you ſhall have farther ſatisfaction, when *I* know wherein you deſire it: *I* hope you need not any.

Of your Book againſt Dr. *Sall*, your Friend in former times, and no Enemy to you at preſent, tho he has left the *Communion* of our *Church*; *I* cannot but acknowledge, that *I* think verily, it argues a great *Zeal* in you, for the truth; and great *charity* for the Soul of that Gentleman: that the *method* you take, and *Spirit* you expreſs in it, are the moſt proper and powerfull can be, to perſwade the People of *Ireland* to an abhorrency of his Example: and therefore *I* do not wonder at Mr. *Stapleton's* converſion, by the reading of it; tho *I* muſt tell you withall, there are ſome, and thoſe not a few paſſages in that Book, which many learned men of our own *Communion* will not allow.

I add that even to my ſelf it appears not a little ſtrange, that upon the ſole account of Mr. *Sall's* having embraced the Communion of the *Church of England*, you repreſent him as gone over unto the *Quakers*, and not to them only, but to all other both ancient and modern Sects

Sects of *Hereticks*. Certainly you are not ignorant that the *Church of England* hath from the very beginning of her *Reformation* under Queen *Elizabeth* received the first four *Generall Councils* even by Act of *Parliament*; and withall incorporated into her *Liturgy* the three ancient *Catholick Creeds*, namely, the *Apostolical*, *Nicene* and *Athanasian*: nor have you forgotten that, besides her *Canons* of Discipline, She hath her xxxix *Articles* of Religion, whereof at least many are without contradiction *Orthodox*, and some the very chief if not only *Fundamentals* of all *Orthodoxy*. Then Reason tells you, that She condemns all, and every of those impious *Sects*, whether old or new, which are either explicitely or implicitely condemned by any *Articles*, *Canons*, *Creeds*, or *Councills* own'd by Her. Behold the cause wherefore I think your Representation of that *Church*, or *Communion* into which Mr. *Sall* is now gone very strange indeed *i. e.* as unlike as ever Picture was drawn. 'Tis true, I cannot exactly tell, nor will take the pains to enumerate how many those impious *Sects* are, that are so condemned by the *Church of England*: but I dare affirm, they are so many as will leave but very few, if any, remaining after them, in your largest Catalogue of *Hereticks*, truly such; and I can assure you, She is not so profuse of her *Communion* as to bestow it on any whom She knows to be of them. She requires of all such, (if not *Abjuration*) at least *Retractation* and *Repentance*, and She requires from all her own native *Sons* much more from *Proselites* that are or would be of the *Clergy*, or graduated in either of her *Universities*, a *Subscription* to all her *Articles*, *Canons*, and *Liturgie*, and by consequence to all the three *Creeds*, and four *Councils* above mentioned. So as without it She admits none to any *Sacerdotall Order*, or *Office*, or to any *Ministry* of *Reconciliation* either by the *Word*, or by the *Sacraments*, or to any *Academical Degree* whatsoever. All which, I think, may sufficiently evince, that instead of representing truly (as you should in answer to your fifth *Query* *) that *Communion* or *Society* into which your friend is gone; you have strangely misrepresented it.

* Dolefull Fall chap. xvi. pag. 218.

Nor can your *Simile* of the *Arke* be to your purpose, unless peradventure you can ruine first all the common Doctrines of our own *Schools* that concern this matter. See our own *Classicall Authors*, where they teach us the immediate *Rule* of humane accations, the nature and effects as well of invincible adherency to *Error*, as of invincible ignorance of *Truth*, how either may excuse both *Incredulity* and *Heresie* from Sin: how the former may sometimes possess even the most learned and most holy, as well *National Churches* as single *Persons*; the distinction between *materiall* and *formal Hereticks*, the consistency of holding *internal Communion* with the *Catholick Church*, and not holding any *external Communion* with Her, but being sententially, effectually, and

and justly too sometimes, excluded from it. When you can overthrow all the *assertions* and *consequences* manifestly derivable from the assertions of our own *Schools*, upon these heads; then, and not before, you may with reason make use of that *Simile* of *Noah's Arke* to your purpose.

How difficult, or rather how unsuccesfull and insuperable, this Task must be to any undertaker (be his *Learning* and *Zeal* never so great) you may guess by a scantlet of it, *tanquam ex ungue leonem*. He must prove, That we justly act against the strongest *convictions* and most immediate *practicall Dictates* of our own Conscience; That we Sin to Death, where we have neither knowledge of any *Law* forbidding our action, nor thoughts of any *Evill* in it, nor have liberty of *Will* to refrain it, or do otherwise; That invincible *Ignorance* of the *positive*, (and not only of the *naturall*) Laws of God can expect no mercy from God; That consequently even the most perfect and holy Souls fallen, however unavoidably or invincibly, into the least *humane Error*, concerning any matter of *Divine Belief* or *Christian Religion*, are at the same time fallen from all saving *Faith*, and all sanctifying *Grace*; and wholy devested of all other, (if yet they be other) infused *Theologicall* habits of *hope* and *love* of God; And the distinction of *Heresie* into *materiall* and *formall* is vain; and the supposition of *internall Communion* with the *Saints* to remain in some cases, notwithstanding all *externall Communion* with the *Church* be utterly quitted, or denied and lost, is false; And those *African* and *Cappadocian* Churches in the days of Pope *Stephen*, and those *Asiaticks* in the time of Pope *Victor*, were truely and simply (*i. e.* both materially, and formally) *Hereticks*; and their cheif Leaders, *Viz.* The Holy *Cyprian*, the Great *Firmilian*, and the more Ancient *Policrates*, however of glorious memory with us, were by themselves no less utterly cut off from all *interiour Communion* with the *invisible Church*, than it was mightily indeavour'd by *Stephen* and *Victor*, to cut them off from all *exterior*, with the *visible*; and so those great *Fathers* of the *Christian World*, in their Generations, above fourteen hundred years since, were nevertheless themselves till death but false *Christians*, and meer *Infidells* in effect. All these *positions*, and as many more as difficult, partly antecedent, and partly consequent unto them, when you shall have demonstrated against our own *Schools*, then and not before, apply the *Arke*. Certainly it is beyond a *Paradox*, because in effect a pure *contradiction*; that any should be within the *invisible Church*, and at the same time be, or dye, or live, or fly out of the *mysticall Arke*: For this *Arke of Christ* (typified by *Noah's*) and that *Church of Saints*, and the *internal Communion* of the one and *spirituall Salvation* of the other, are the very same things under different names.

And

And yet obſerve, that all this while I diſpute not your *latent Suppoſition*, namely, that the *Church of Rome* makes up the whole of that *Myſticall Ark*; or (which is the ſame thing,) the whole of that one Holy *Catholick* and *Apoſtolick Church*, into which we are baptiz'd, and which we believe. To diſpute a *Suppoſition*, which whether granted as *true*, or denied as *falſe*, would be equally *excentrick* to my purpoſe, were needleſly to create both you and my ſelf new trouble. What I would be at is quite another thing.

I would convince of Sin your application of the *Ark*, to the Church of *England*, whatever in the mean time we ſuppoſe the Church of *Rome* to be: and ſurely to do this, can be no hard matter now. For if the laſt *practical dictate* of our own proper Conſcience be the immediate *Rule* of our Actions; and to act againſt that, be no leſs then to Sin againſt God: if invincible *prepoſſeſſion* of Soul, as well by whatſoever *Errors* in matters of Faith, as by pure *Ignorance* of ſuch matters, may excuſe from Sin, and expect Mercy at laſt: if not only a few *ſingle Perſons*, and not only the *Illiterate* and *Vitious*, but the moſt *Learned Holy Men*; and together with them very great and *National* and conſpicuous and *Catholick* Churches remaining ſtill in the *Myſtical Ark*, have been *de facto* under ſuch invincible prepoſſeſſions, by ſtrong Errors; and have contended for them to Death againſt other Churches no leſs numerous and *Catholick* that oppos'd them: and conſequently if the diſtinction of *Hereſie* or *Hereticks* into *materiall* and *formall* be not without ground; and the ſuppoſition of *interior Communication* with the *Inviſible* Church to remain in ſome contingencies after all *exterior* with the *Viſible* is utterly loſt, be not without reaſon: or if the known *Doctrines* both of our own *Schools* and *Church*, upon thoſe heads, cannot be proved falſe, nor the contrary poſition true: and withall if God alone be the *Searcher of Hearts*, and diſcerner of thoughts, and the Seer of Invincibleneſs whether of *Error* or *Ignorance* in the Soul; and the Seperator of *Erring Catholicks*, from *Hereticks* truly ſuch, as of *Sheep* from *Goats*; and the Surveyor of them, who in the Language of the Apoſtle are *Judæi in abſcondito*, ſecret Communicants at the inviſible Table of the Saints in the *militant* Church; and the knower of thoſe he has predeſtinated to live for ever in the *triumphant*; then certainly your application of the *Ark* to the *Church of England* is convinced of Sin. Rom. 2. 29.

It is, if ever yet there was, a violation, and a violation too in the higheſt nature imaginable of that Commandment of our Lord, *Nolite judicare*: it is, in a matter of the greateſt importance conceivable, the moſt temerarious, peremptory, cruell Judgment, that could be given by Mortal Man of other Mortals: it excludes for ever,

as well *Secundum præſentem* as *Secundum futuram juſtitiam* all the Church of *England* univerſally both *Prieſts* and *People* out of the *Myſtical Ark* of *Chriſt*. And ſo without any remorſe or regret, I am ſure without any ſufficient examination of their cauſe, without any allowance to the invincible prepoſſeſſions of their minds, without any regard of their particular merits or demerits, your application of the *Ark* of God utterly razeth out of the *Book of Life*, ſo many Millions of *Chriſtian Souls*, who have ſince the beginning of the *Reformation* died and ſhall hereafter dye in the *Church of England* while She continues. It looks upon them all promiſcuouſly as *Veſſels of Wrath*, that is, it ſuppoſes, nay, it either directly, or at leaſt indirectly and conſequentially, firſt pronounces them all, every one pertinacious *Hereticks*, meer *Reprobates*, men of ſeared Conſciences in the whole courſe of their Life, and of unrepentant thoughts at the hour of their Deaths, and perfectly ſtript of all *Grace*, and *Faith*, and *Hope*, and *Love*, and *Favour* of God in Life and Death.

And then for their comfort afterwards in the other World; it condemns them all (without exception or diſcrimination) to a deluge of *Fire*, and the torments of *Hell*, and life of *Devils* for a long Eternity. The ſame very juſt and very charitable regard it has for ſo many hundred Millions alſo of other *Chriſtians*, who have theſe 800 years paſt in other parts of the Earth, as well died as lived out of the external Communion of *Rome*; and yet were none of thoſe *Sects* you name, nor (for ought you or I know) of any other *Sect* properly and truly ſuch. And all this without ground in *Scripture*, or warrant from *Tradition*, or ſemblance from *Reaſon*, or even countenance from the Authority either of our own *Church* or *Schools*, unleſs we allow them to ſpeak and act contradictorily in their own ſpecial high Concerns. Your application therefore is convinc'd of Sin, if the moſt unchriſtian rigor of *uncharitableneſs* and *injuſtice* to other Men, whereof the raſheſt and moſt ungrounded, and moſt forbidden *Judgment* is capable, be not either a Vertue, or at leaſt an indifferent thing. Beſides it is yet convinc'd of Sin, upon a much higher account, then that of being *injurious* to Man in any degree whatſoever. It is even a *ſacrilegious* uſurpation of the peculiar Rights of God himſelf. For ſince you cannot deny that (beſides other *Arguments*) our own *Schools* and *Church* do abundantly warrant us, that there is no *general Revelation* for it, either in the written or unwritten Word; and ſince you pretend not to any *ſpecial Revelation* from Heaven, or any ſpecial Priviledge above other Men, to enter into the Sanctuary of God, and to aſſiſt at the Councils of the *Trinity*: nothing can be more plain then that by it (*i. e.*) by a judgment ſo peremptory, abſolute and unconditional in ſuch a matter, as yours of the Church of *England* is, you have

Bolefull Fall, p. 32. & 328.

have invaded, and not only invaded but actually uſurped an *Office* peculiar to the omniſcient God alone; you have placed your ſelf *Aſſeſſor* with him on his Throne of *Judicature*, and which is yet more tranſcendently bold, you have pronounced Sentence before He has opened his Mouth: than which if any Attempt of a mortal Man againſt the immortal God of Glory can be more Sacrilegious, be your ſelf the Judge. And whether it be not in a very extraordinary manner an imitation of that either mortal Creature or immortal Spirit, who ſaid in his elevation of pride, *Aſcendam ſuper altitudinem nubium,* Iſa. 14. 13. *ſedebo in monte Teſtamenti, in Lateribus Aquilonis; in cælum conſcendam; ſuper aſtra Dei exaltabo ſolium meum; ſimilis ero Altiſſimo*; I will not determine, but leave this alſo to your own recollected thoughts.

Such are my thoughts of that *Judgment* of yours, ſuch my *Conviction* of the ſinfulneſs of it, and ſuch the *Concluſions* I would be at by the *Premiſes* of this Diſcourſe as properly derivable from them, and ſuitable to this place. All ſevere enough I confeſs, but no more *ſevere* then *juſt*: They enter not into the Cloſets of your *Conſcience*; they pretend not to ſee what is inviſible in your *Soul*; they touch not your *interior* at all; they know not what the *method* or *meaſure* was of your inward information by that *Judgment*, before you gave it in writing; they are wholly ignorant whether ever you had any reflection upon, or any doubt, or thought, or ſcruple, or fear of any *unlawfulneſs* in it; or if you have had any ſuch *apprehenſions*, whether you were not quickly diſpoſſeſt of them by ſtronger *fancies*, (*i.e.*) by arguments that appear'd to you unanſwerable; in a word, (and if I may venture to ſpeak in the language of the *Schools*,) they cenſure not that *Judgment* of yours *ſubjectively* taken (*i. e.*) as it informs its own proper Subject, your underſtanding; but *objectively*, or as it is an object of yours and mine, and every other underſtanding, that reflects upon it in your Book, and meaſures it by the *Law* and *Teſtimony*, but not by your miſapprehenſions or inadvertencyes of either. And God forbid I ſhould mean otherwiſe! I am ſure I do not: and I hope you will not think me ſo either unreaſonable or forgetful, as to judge of your *interiour* farther than you expreſs it; when at the ſame time, and only on the ſame or like account, I quarrel with you, and take ſo much pains to perſwade you, that God alone and not you, or any mortal ought to judge the *interior* of others.

Having ſo explained my ſelf, I ſhall now with the more confidence mind you of St. *Auſtin's* judgment in the main Debate concerning thoſe in general who are not to be accounted *Hereticks*. For your other latent Suppoſition of the *Church of England's* being *Heretical* becauſe of her maintaining ſeveral Doctrines againſt the *Roman Catholick* Faith,

Epiſtle 162. *It is directed or ſuperſcribed in this form.* Dominis dilectiſſimis & merito prædicandis Fratribus, Glorio, Eleuſio, Fælici, Grammatico, & cæteris omnibus quibus hoc gratum eſt. Auguſt.

I take to be the only ground of your applying that *Simile* of the *Ark* to Her, by a Judgment ſo unlawfull. Let us therefore ſee now, whether you and St. *Auſtin* agree upon this ground. It is in the very beginning of his famous *Epiſtle* to all the *Donatiſt* Biſhops: he declares his Judgment in theſe Words. *Dixit quidem Apoſtolus Paulus, Hæreticum hominem poſt unam correptionem devita, ſciens quia ſubverſus eſt ejuſmodi, & peccat, & eſt a ſemet ipſo damnatus: ſed qui ſententiam ſuam quamvis falſam atque perverſam nulla pertinaci animoſitate defendunt præſertim quam non audacia præſumptionis ſuæ pepererunt; aut * quærunt autem cauta ſollicitudine veritatem, corrigi parati, cum invenerint, nequaquam ſunt inter Hæreticos deputandi.* So he in *Theſi*: and ſo you in *Hypotheſi* muſt have this great Luminary of the *Latin* Church your great Antagoniſt. But I hope you will be better adviſed then to contend with his *Authority*, whatever you do againſt my *Reaſon*.

* *Sed a ſeductis atque in errorem lapſis parentibus acceperunt.*

However it will be no cauſe of deſpondency, if on peruſal of theſe lines you pauſe a little, and enfranchiſe your ſelf a while (tho but for ſome few minutes) from the tyranny of *forreign* Sentiments, and then conſult your own *native* Thoughts, and then demand of your own Inward man whether is likelyeſt to proceed from God, the pious *Moderation* of the moſt eminent holy *Doctors* of the *Chriſtian* World in the *primitive* Ages? or the fiery *Zeal* of the ignorant *Bigots* and other intereſted men in the much *later* and worſer Ages of the *Church*? or which is the ſafeſt or moſt becoming a Man of your quality and years to follow? But if at the ſame time, you reſolve to follow the Voice that ſhall anſwer you from within; there will be cauſe enough for me to change my uncertain *hope* to more certain *expectation*. For beſides, that you know already, that the preſent *Church of England's* Profeſſors now living, have not boldly or preſumptuouſly (or indeed any way at all) invented of themſelves, but only received from their ſeduced Parents thoſe opinions which they defend againſt the preſent *Church of Rome*, you will then conſider, how poſſible it is, that the ignorance of *Truth* in ſome, and the adherence to *Error* in others of them, may be ſuch in very deed as to be *invincible* by any induſtry of theirs: and that as well *theſe*, as *thoſe* may defend their falſe opinions without any pertinacious animoſity; and may enquire after the truth with all wary ſollicitude; and may with all due preparation of Mind, and reſignation of Will, and fervency of Deſire, be reſolved to embrace the Truth, and ſubmit their Errors to the correction of it, whenſoever they ſhall find it. You will conſider alſo that, for ought any mortal man does, or can without ſpecial Revelation know, all this not only may be ſo, but is ſo already, with many thouſands and ten thouſands of the *Church of England*.

1. Becauſe what would make it be ſo, and without which it would be otherwiſe with them, are thoſe infuſed ſupernatural Habits of *ſanctifying Grace*, and *Faith*, and *Hope*, and *Charity*, wherewith they were clothed by the Spirit of God at the Sacred Font of *Baptiſm*: and beſides there are thoſe other Graces of *Chriſt*, which in relation to thoſe *habituall* and *permanent* ones are called *actuall* and *tranſient*, but in reference to the Will either *efficacious* or *ſufficient*. Now it is without contradiction, that all ſuch Heavenly *Gifts* of either ſort, *habituall* or *actuall*, are pure inward *Spiritual forms* affecting the *Soul* only, and therefore inviſible to any other but God. And conſequently it is plain that as well their *non-exiſtence*, or not being in the Souls of any Sons or Daughters of the *Church of England*; as their *exiſtence*, or being in either of them, cannot fall under the knowledge of any creature, without ſpecial Revelation from the all ſeeing Creator himſelf.

2. Becauſe all thoſe divine both *habitual* and *actual* Qualifications of the Soul are compatible with all ſuch *Errors* even in matters of *Chriſtian Faith*, as are not *culpable* to them or (which is the ſame thing) *vincible* by them, or by any diligence they can uſe who fall into them. Otherwiſe what ſhould we ſay is become of ſo many of the bleſſed primitive *Fathers*, of Eternal Memory, whereof ſome were *Rebaptizers* with *Cyprian*, others *Quartadecimans* with *Policrates*, and others *Chiliaſts* with *Juſtin* the Martyr and *Papias*? what of ſo many other Eminent Holy *Catholick Doctors*, who, in the Succeſſion of following ages, maintained other Opinions, and both lived and died in them, which are now condemned by us? and above all what *ſhould* we, or what *can* we anſwer to thoſe men, who to maintain the contrary Doctrine, would have us frame unto our ſelves their affrightning *Ideas* of a cruell *Tyrant-God*, as the proper repreſentative of the only true God.

All this you will then conſider when you reſolve to obey the Voice, that anſwers you from within: and out of all, you will then conclude what unavoidably follows, (*viz.*) that in order, at leaſt to the *inviſible Church*, or *internal Communion* of Saints, and for ought you, or any other mortal man does know, or can know without ſpecial Revelation; there are many *Thouſands*, and ten Thouſands, if not *Millions* of the *Church of England*, that are not to be reputed *Hereticks*: and this Conviction of your Soul you will openly declare, as becomes your Candor and Conſcience: for *with the heart man believes unto Righteouſneſs, and with the mouth confeſſion is made unto Salvation*, as the Apoſtle ſays, tho upon another Subject: and ſo at laſt you will perfectly agree with *St. Auſtin* in his old *Theſis*, and wholy quit your own contrary new *Hypotheſis*. Nor will you hold this change of Judgment any diſparagement to you. *Injuſta definitio ſalubriter diſſolvenda.* Rom. x. 11.

22 9. 4 Cap. Definitio. Concil : Eliber. cap. 1.

venda eſt, nec ea reputanda eſt prævaricatio, ſed temeritatis emendatio: ſo ſay our *Papall Canons* out of the ancient Council of *Eliberis*. And all men ſay, that St. *Auſtin* himſelf appears no where ſo great and glorious, as in his two Books of *Retractations*, which he writ laſt of all his Works and in the end of his days, when he was much about your Age.

But while my Fancies flatter me with Expectation of your following henceforth in theſe matters (as you do already follow in many others) the *doctrine* and *example* of the bleſſed Biſhop of *Hippo*, be pleaſed to take ſpeciall notice that I touch not here the *external Judicatory* of the *Church*. That is not my Buſineſs in this Letter. And you might ſee all along, I have ſpoken of *Hereticks* in relation only to the Judgment of *God*, and *inviſible Church*, and puniſhments in the other Life. To ſpeak of them in this ſenſe (which is the proper ſenſe, according to the *Schools* definitions of *Hereſie*) was it, that, a confutation of your *Hypotheſis* and *Simile* muſt have required. Beſides I conſidered that whom *God* ſees not to be *Hereticks*; it is no *Decree*, no *Canon*; no *Condemnation*, nor *Anathema maranatha* pronounced againſt them by the *Church* that can make them ſimply or truly *Hereticks*. They may indeed be made *ſecundum quid* or preſumptively ſuch by Her; they may upon meer outward preſumption of the inward thing, have the name of *Hereticks* given them by the *Church* in order to their puniſhment in this life, either by her *Cenſures* or by the Civil Magiſtrates *Sword*. And She may do ſo to them without any injuſtice, if She proceed againſt them fairly according to the rules of *Reaſon*, and her own ancient univerſal *Canons*. Tho after all diligence uſed by her, She may be deceived in matter of *Facti*, and accordingly determine; for ſo ſay our own *Scholaſticks*, and *Bellarmin* amongſt them: and ſo ſaid all mortal men, before the new hereſie of the latter Jeſuits ſprung up in the Colledge of *Clermont*, * which (deſignedly to maintain that Bull of *Alexander* the 7th. whereby the *five* condemned *Propoſitions* were declared to be in *Auguſtinus Janſenij*) attributed the very ſame *Infallibility*, even in matters of *Facti* to the *Pope*, that *Jeſus Chriſt* had when he was upon Earth. If we take *Bellarmin's* word or proof, She has already been thus deceiv'd: She has about a thouſand years ſince, at *Conſtantinople*, by the *Sixth* and *Seventh* of her *Oecumenical Repreſentatives*, erroneouſly condemned Pope *Honorius* for a *Monothelite* Heretick, and anathematiz'd his memory; and they grounded their ſentence on clear Miſtakes, not of matters Inviſible to them, ſuch as the *inward* qualifications of the mind of *Honorius* were, but of matters properly ſubject to their Cognizance, ſuch as the *outward* profeſſions or declarations of his Soul and Sentiments, under his own hand-writing in a Letter to the Patriark of *Conſtantinople*, muſt needs have been.

* in their printed Theſis, 12 Decem. 1662.

Whether

Whether She may not, by the like *Oecumenical Repreſentatives*, err, as well in defining *Doctrines* to be *heretical*, as in judging *Perſons* to be *Hereticks*? whether She has not *de facto* err'd ſo in ſuch a Repreſentative at *Ariminum* under the Emperor *Conſtantius*, when *Liberius* was Biſhop of *Rome*? whether ſhe has not again erred ſo, in latter times, either in the Councils of *Conſtance* and *Baſill*, under *Martin* and *Eugenius*, or in the 5th. of *Lateran* under *Leo* xth? For they contradicted one another in their *Definitions* of a moſt important matter of *Faith*; or at leaſt, which both ſides held to be of Faith: and to come yet nearer home; whether She has ever yet, by any of all her *Synods* truly *Oecumenical*, condemned thoſe *Doctrines* or any of them which the preſent *Church of England* holds for an *Article of Religion*; and the *Church of Rome* anathematizes? would be worth the while to conſider in this place, were it of any Concern to the former diſcourſe. But it is not: there is neither *propoſition* nor *ſuppoſition* in my whole diſcourſe againſt your *Hypotheſis*, but abſtracts as well from the Fallibility as Infallability of the *Catholick Church*, either when ſhe judges any *Perſons*, or condemns any *Doctrines*, and as well alſo from the preſent *Church of England's* not being yet condemned by any *Oecumenical Synod*, truly ſo called, or from her being already condemned by ſuch a *Synod*: ſo that the only *medium* running through every part of this Diſcourſe, and connecting all the parts of it together, is wholy unconcerned for it in any anſwer whatſoever that may be given by either ſide, to the above *Queries* or to any of them; which is the reaſon, I give you no farther trouble now by conſidering them more particularly.

Only by occaſion of the *laſt* of them, give me leave to tell you, that the general and perpetuall *Plea* of the *Church of England* in defence of her ſelf, and thoſe Doctrines of hers, which (tho not as hers or under her name, were condemned as *Hereticall* by the preſent Church of *Rome*, (*i. e.*) by *Leo* the xth. and Council of *Trent*, and *Julius*, *Paulus*, and *Pius*, &c.) ſeems neither ſo ungrounded in point of *natural reaſon*, nor ſo unwarranted by the *Catholick Canons*, nor ſo unpreſidented in the *primitive ages* of *Chriſtian Religion* among the beſt Men and Churches, as not to deſerve more exact reflections, and a ſtricter enquiry into the heads and merits of it then, I can perceive by your writings, has been made by you in all your life.

She pleads the incompetency of thoſe *Judges*, the illegality of their *Tribunals*, the nullity of their *Juriſdictions*, at leaſt in order to her.

Againſt the *Pope* ſhe alledges, that being a *party*, and the very cheif accuſed party, he nevertheleſs made himſelf *Judge* in his own beloved cauſe, as he has indeed in all other theſe ſix hundred years. That were he *indifferent* in the cauſe

as

as it is manifeſt he was not, yet neither divine nor human Right had made him an authoritative *Judge* to bind her. That to ſpeak preciſely; *de jure Divino*, all *Biſhops* and Churches of the Earth are coordinate, * and *Reggium & Rocheſter* equal to *Rome*: tho' *de jure humano* by all humane right derivable, either from the *Canons* of the *Catholick Church* or *Laws* of the *Civil power*, the *Britannick* Churches particularly have from the beginning alſo been free, always exempt from the authority of any foreign Church or *Biſhop*. That the only humane Conſtitution, tho' not an *Eccleſiaſticall*, but a meer *Civil* one ſeeming for the Biſhop of *Rome*, namely that *Novell* of *Valentinian* the third, obtained by *Leo magnus* to impower the *Roman Biſhop* to give Law to all the Churches within the Princes part of the *Roman Empire*, could never take effect or place in *Great Brittain*; becauſe this Iſland was not then *de facto*, nor any more *de jure*, ſubject to the *Empire*, but enfranchis'd from it by the Law of *Arms* and *Nations*: tho had the *Novell* been obeyed ſome few years, in *Great Brittain*, (as for ought may be known from *Records*, or *Hiſtorie*, or otherwiſe, it never was ſo much as for one hour, or in any one inſtance, yet 1200 years effluxed ſince muſt be a fair time to *preſcribe* againſt it, or any other humane Conſtitution. That whatever the Incroachments of the *Biſhop of Rome* in latter Ages on the *Britannick* Churches, or the Connivance of ſome of their *Princes* at thoſe Incroachments has been at ſeveral times ſince the *Norman Conqueſt*, yet the ancient Monuments of *Brittain* and the * ancient Canon at *Epheſus*, (tho' made by the occaſion only of a complaint exhibited by the *Cyprian* Biſhops againſt the *Antiochian* Patriark) and the Anſwer of the *Britiſh* Clergie to *Auſtin* the Monk, and the ſucceſs of *Wilfrids* Appeals to *Rome* under the *Saxon* Kings, and ſo many ſevere Laws of *Proviſors* and *Premunire*, enacted by thoſe very *Roman-Catholick* Princes of the *Norman* Race, that conniv'd moſt of any, ſome times at the *Pope*; are manifeſt Proofs, that as neither *Britans* nor *Saxons*, nor

* See the Goſpel *Matth.* 18. ver. 18. and *John* 20. ver. 21. 22. 23. and the *Fathers*, *viz.* St. *Cyprian*, *Origen*, *Hilary*, *Gaudentius*, *Brixianus*, *Auguſtin*, *Hierom*, *Ambroſe*, *Leo*, *Theophylact*, *Euthymius*, *Bede*; St. *Thomas* in his *Catena Aurea*, *Lyra*, *Concil. Lemovic. apud Baron.* Tom. xi. *Annal. ad annum* 1034. *Num.* xi. *ſub ann.* 1544. *Ubi de ſex mod. reformat.* All of them on the metaphor of the Keys. *Matth.* 16.

Read the 630. *Fathers* of *Chalcedon*, in their 28*th. Canon*, where they expreſly ſay the *Roman See* had its Privileges from the *Fathers*, *quod urbs illa imperaret*, and therefore, (and in purſuance alſo of a former *Canon* made in the *Second General Council*, do equal in all Priviledges (excepting only that of Precedence) the See of *Conſtantinople* to it; ſince *Conſtantinople* is no leſs honour'd with the Imperial Seat and Senat.

Conſult *Anaſtas. Bibiothec.* and *Paulus Diaconus Edit. vet.* where they alſo expreſly tell it was *Phocas* the *Tyrant*, that made the Biſhop of *Rome* Oecumenical.

* *Conc. Epheſ.* 1 *Act. Sept. Seſs. en Decreto* &c.

Vid. Binnium Tom. 2. *pag.* 424. 425. 426. *Edit. Pariſ. anno* 1636.

nor laſt of all the *Normans* inhabiting *Great Brittain* did ever allow of any of his pretences to *Divine Right*; ſo they never did ſuffer any of his Uſurpations to preſcribe the leaſt *humane Right* of Superiority over them.

That to alledge the Canon of *Sardica* for *Appeals* to him can evince nothing againſt the *Britannick Churches*, 'tis granted, that the *Occidental Fathers* remaining at *Sardica*, (after the departure of the *Orientals* to *Philippopolis*) did at the inſtance of *Hoſius* give to the *Biſhop of Rome* (ſo far as in them lay) the authority and privilege of receiving the *Appeals* of Biſhops, tho' not thoſe of inferior Clerks: but it is not granted that there was one *Britiſh* Biſhop among thoſe *Occidentals*, or that ever that *Canon* was received either in *Britain* particularly, or generally among other *Catholick Churches*: to the contrary there are many things known. Thoſe *Sardican* Fathers after the Rent, were no more *Oecumenical* or *General* but at the beſt a *Regional Synod*. They were not in all an hundred, notwithſtanding the vulgar Error ſays otherwiſe; and which is more to the purpoſe, they were ſo far from being regarded that they were extreamly ſlighted by the reſt of the World. As for the *Canon of Appeals* made by them it was looked upon generally, as an Introduction of Tyrannical Power and Wordly Pride into the Church: the *Orientals* ſcorn'd it, the *Southern* Churches (*i. e.*) their Repreſentatives even 217 *Affrican Biſhops*, whereof St. *Auſtin* was one, did by a moſt ſingular Example to Poſterity, both ſeverely conteſt and utterly reject it; Pope *Zoſimus* himſelf durſt not father it on *Sardica*, but impos'd it on *Nicea*; the truly general Synod of *Epheſus* under *Theodoſius* the younger, which was held not long after that *Sardican*, eſtabliſht, in effect, a *Canon* very contrary to it; namely, that *Canon*, or *Decree* which concerns all Churches that had not been originally under any of the great Patriarks: and the Conteſt of the *Britans* themſelves with *Auſtin* the Monk, which happened two hundred years after both that Council of *Sardica*, and this other of *Epheſus* plainly ſhews they were not concerned in it: and the Biſhops ſucceeding ever ſince in their Sees, ſucceed alſo in their freedom from it. Tho' had it been at firſt both canonical eſtabliſhed by a *General Council* truly ſuch, and received by the *Britains*, and never after by a contrary *Canon* repeal'd, or by a contrary Cuſtom or diſuſe ceaſed, or by any Abuſe forfeited; yet every man ſees it extends not to the making of new, or aboliſhing of old *Canons*, or to the naming of *Biſhops*, or giving of *Benefices*, or ſummoning or diſſolving of *Councils*, or declaring, who are, and who are not *Hereticks*, or to any other Cauſe or Privilege, but only that of receiving the *Appeals of Biſhops*, and to that neither when the Laws of the ſupream *Civil power* do forbid it.

That certainly therefore King *Henry* the Eighth by his Laws againſt the *Pope*, did not caſt out of his Dominions any *Juriſdiction*, *Right*, or *Authority*, warranted either by the *Canons* of the *Catholick Church*, or by any other *Laws* of God or Man; but only thoſe uncanonical and illegal, and intolerable *Uſurpations* of the *Pope*, under which the *Britannick* Churches did ſo often groan before.

And that although it be acknowledged, that to remedy thoſe oppreſſing Evils, to throw them out at once, and ſhut them out for ever; that magnanimous *King* did take indeed a more effectual ſpeedy courſe by one *Statute* only, than all his *Predeceſſors* had done by ſo great a variety of ſevere *Laws*; yet withal it is no leſs truly averr'd that in this great Affair, he was not byaſt nor ſwayed at all, either by his own private Inclination, or by any of the *Reformed Religion*. He was in himſelf a long time, both wholly and ſtrongly averſe from it: And no *Reformer* had power with him, but every one of them were mortally hated by him. The two *Univerſities* and three Eſtates of *Parliament*, and the Reverend Houſes of *Convocation*, and conſequently all the *Biſhops* and *Arch-Biſhops* of *England*, beſides thoſe other Authors and Approvers of the *Oath of Supremacy*, were They, whoſe Judgment, Advice, Authority, Prayer did perſuade him throughly at laſt: And they were all of them *Roman Catholick* Profeſſors, and the *Prince* himſelf, as great a *Zealot* of that *Religion* and as great an *Enemy* to the *Proteſtant Reformation*, till he breathed his laſt, as any of Them could be. Nor ſurely can the Contrivers and Enactors of the *Six Bloody Articles* againſt the *Reformers*, be thought to have had either leſs Zeal for the *Old* Belief and Rites of *Rome*, or leſs averſion from the *New* of the preſent Church of *England*; and yet they were the chief Enacters alſo of that other *Law*, which put a final period, ever ſince, to all Uſurpations of the *Pope* in *England*.

Againſt the *Council of Trent* ſhe objecteth that it was neither *Oecumenical*, nor *Occidental* nor *Free*.

Not *Oecumenical*. Becauſe it had no Repreſentatives, but of one only of the *Five* grand *Patriarkſhips*: and in ſome of her *Seſſions*, very few out of that one. As for Example: in the very *firſt Seſſion* but *five and twenty Prelates*; in the *ſecond* and *third* but *three and forty Perſons*; and in the *fourth* (altho' for the Conſequence of it, the moſt material of all the *Seſſions* of that *Council*,) not above *threeſcore* in the whole of all ſorts. For even this ſo ſmall a number of *Eccleſiaſticks*, who at the *Popes* pleaſure took upon them both to repreſent and conclude the *Militant Church* of *Chriſt* whereſoever diffuſed throughout the four Quarters of the World, were not all of them *Biſhops*: Among them were at leaſt *Two Cardinals*, not ſo much as Ordained *Prieſts*, and

Three

Three Abbots of the Congregation of *Caſſina*, and the *Four Generals* of the *Four Mendicant Orders*; and yet neither *Abbots* nor *Generals* had *Deciſive* Voices, ſo that in the very *Fourth Seſſion* they were but *Three and Fifty* who had deciſive Votes. (*Viz.*) *Five Cardinals, and Eight and Forty Biſhops*: the reſt had only *deliberative* voices.

Not *Occidental*. *Firſt*, Becauſe there was no admittance in it of the *Biſhops* or Repreſentatives of ſeveral intire Kingdoms of the *Occidental* Church, to vote, or deliberate, or ſit as *Members*; but only to ſtand in the quality of *Criminals* at the Bar, and to receive their Sentence from an adverſe pre-occupated Party. And this was contrary even to the former late Proceedings in the Council of *Florence* it ſelf, under Pope *Eugenius* IV. In this *Florentine Council* compoſed of *Greeks* and *Latins*, it is well known, that notwithſtanding their former great, and long, and fatal *Schiſm*; and that untill that very meeting at *Florence*, they charged one another in their Books with above forty *Hereſies*, and Yearly Anathematiz'd one another, yet without any previous *Recantation* or *Abſolution* of either ſide, they ſat together on equal terms in the ſame Church (which was the *Auguſtinians* Church in *Florence*) and conſulted and voted, and concluded equally as Members of that Council.

Secondly, Becauſe of the Severe Bull of *Paul* the Third, which (contrary to all Reaſon, and Law, and Precedents alſo of all former *Councils*, and only through fear of ſeeing his own Court-Party born down by a greater number of others,) commanded under pain of Suſpenſion *ipſo facto*, that no *Biſhop* of Chriſtendom ſhould on any pretence appear by *Proctor* in it. For in Proſecution of this Tyrannical and Fraudulent *Bull*, ſent in great Secrecy by him to the *Legats* preſiding in his Name at *Trent*; all the very moſt Legal and Canonical *Roman Catholick* Repreſentatives of all the Churches of *Poland*, *Germany* and Kingdom of *Naples*, or (which is the ſame thing) all the *Proctors* of all their *Biſhops*, (and by conſequent of well nigh one entire moiety of the *Occidental* or *Latin* Church) were by thoſe *Legates* effectually excluded, and not only during the Life of that *Pope*, and of *Julius* the Third alſo, that ſucceeded him, but untill, at leaſt, the ſecond Renovation of that *Council* under *Pius* the Fourth were utterly denyed admittance to ſit, or vote in it; and yet in four only of thoſe ten *Seſſions* of it held under *Paul* the Third, there were *threeſcore and eight* Definitions or *Canons of Faith* in ſo many diſtinct *Anathematiſms*, agreed upon and made and publiſhed; beſides their other *Canons of Reformation*, and none of either ſort of *Canons* were ſuffered by either of thoſe other two ſucceeding Popes, who Governed that Council, *Julius* or *Pius*, to be debated or diſcuſt anew, or called in queſtion at all, when the *Council* came to be a

little fuller, and the *Proctors* of ſome abſent Biſhops were admitted, tho' the number of *Biſhops* that defin'd them or any of them, under *Paul* the Third, did never, at any time, exceed *Threeſcore*, a number leſs by *Forty*, than that of thoſe Biſhops of the Kingdom of *Naples* only, whoſe Proctors, together with all other Proctors of Biſhops, were excluded, even all along, from the Year 1545. when the *Council* firſt began, untill at leaſt 1562. the laſt before it ended.

3. Becauſe in it the *Italick* Nation alone concluded all the Nations of *Europe*, (I might ſay of the *World*) whether preſent or abſent; And this alſo was againſt another Precedent of the *Florentin Council*, and againſt the true primary intrinſick end of all *Councils*. Beſides it was diametrically oppoſite to the former courſe obſerv'd in thoſe very great and famous *Occidental* Synods of *Baſil* and *Conſtance*: for in them every *Nation* aſſembled by it ſelf, and in ſuch their national meetings apart, reſolved according to the number of Voices. But when all the *Nations* met together Conciliarly, the *General Deciſion* was eſtabliſht not by the ſuffrage of particular *Men*, but by the plurality of the Voices of the *Nations*.

Not *Free*. Becauſe all the *Members* of it, to a man, were ſworn Vaſſals to the *Pope*, by the ſtricteſt *Oath of fidelity* that could be drawn by Pen. And the *proponentibus Legatis*, and the continual directions by the *Mail*, and the number of *Titulars*, and *Penſioners*, and even *Renouncers*, hurried on a ſudden from the *Court* to the *Council*, and the Arch-Biſhop of *Oihanto*, with his forty ſure Seconds, and the place it ſelf of *Trent*, ſo much at the devotion of *Rome*; and many other, both fine *Devices*, and frightning *Menaces*, of the *Pope*, and of his *Legates* preſiding in the *Council*, might be added, were it neceſſary. But after that *Oath* once mentioned there needs no more be ſaid. It is not only an *Oath* that has been unknown to all *Chriſtian Biſhops* and *Churches*, for a whole thouſand years from *Chriſt* downwards; nor only an *Oath* that is repugnant to the duty of every good *Subject* on Earth, who is ſubject to any other *Prince*, or *State* beſides the *Pope*; but an *Oath* that tyrannizes over all freedom of Religion, Reaſon, Conſcience; an *Oath* that betrays all the *Chriſtian Churches* of the World to the lordly Will of one ſingle man: but therefore an *Oath* ſo neceſſary to the *Pope*, that being deſired to diſpence in it, with the Members of the *Council*, or at leaſt, to ſuſpend the obligation of it during the *Seſſions*; he expreſly refuſed to do either.

So that to a ſedate Conſiderer, at leaſt of all other Things and Circumſtances together with that *Oath*, it muſt appear, that ſince the ſecond *Epheſine* Council (that *Latrocinium* or *Synodus prædatoria*, as it is commonly called) wherein the good Patriarch *Flavianus* was wounded, impriſon'd, and fetterd; and the whole *Catholick* Party, through

through fear of the like bloody violence forced to ſubſcribe *Eutychianiſme*, there has never been held within the bounds of the *Latin Church* any which on the leaſt tolerable ground might challenge the name of *Oecumenical*, that was ſo far in all reſpects, from being *free*, as the Council of *Trent* was. The forementioned Council of *Florence* under *Eugenius* iv., and the other at *Lyons* under *Gregory* the x. were the only Councils held within that Time and Tract; which together with the Repreſentatives of the *Latin Church* had true *Members*, *Proxies* and *Legates* from the *Oriental* and other *Patriarchall* Churches of the *Greek* Communion, ſitting in them; aud therefore alſo were the only Councils held within that Time and Tract, which on the leaſt tolerable ground may challenge the name of *Oecumenical*. But it is manifeſt in *Hſtory*, that no Repreſentatives of the *Greek* Communion, in either of theſe two *Councils*, were by the aforeſaid, or any other *Oath*, or by any *Canon* which they owned, or in any other manner by any *Office* or *Benifice*, or *Title*, or any kind of *Church* or *State* preferment, bound to obſerve the dictates of the *Pope*. They were all of them perfectly *free* in both *Councils*, notwithſtanding that thoſe *Popes* themſelves, were perſonally preſent, *Gregory* at *Lyons*, and *Engenius* at *Florence*. And though compar'd to the *Latin Repreſentatives*, they were but very few in number; yet in weight and Vote, as to all the controverted Points, they were equal to the whole *Latin Church*. In the Council of *Trent* we have already ſeen, 'twas far otherwiſe in both reſpects; there was neither *Side*, nor *Bench*, in it but of Men that were Bondmen to the *Pope*, as well by virtue of the foreſaid *Oath* of Vaſſallage made unto Him, as by reaſon of their manifold *dependencies* on him almoſt in all things, whether of this World or of the other: tho' it be confeſſed there were among them Thoſe, that took to heart their bondage and laboured all they durſt, to free themſelves and others from it; but all they durſt came to nothing. For at leaſt as to matter of *Reformation* (which if it had ſucceeded, was the only thing that could enfranchize them, as it was the only ſcope aimed at by thoſe *Princes* and *People*, who preſt ſo long and ſo hard for a *Council*,) it's clear, that one ſingle Vote of an hungry *Italian Paraſite*, or one ſingle Suffrage of any, (whether feared or zealous) *Papelin* whatſoever, above the preciſe number on the other ſide, weighed down the Scales; and ſilenced both ſides preſently, and left neither of them any more to ſay or do; ſuch was the great *Freedom*, and ſuch alſo was the great *Equity* of that *Council of Trent*. But ſurely neither the one nor the other was, by ten degrees, ſo little in the Synods of *Conſtance* and *Baſill*, nor in the *Florentine*, nor any other *Synod*, whether *Oecumenical*, or *Regional* juſtly ſo called.

Againſt

little fuller, and the *Proctors* of ſome at ſent Biſhops were admitted, tho' the number of *Biſhops* that defin'd them or any of them, under *Paul* the Third, did never, at any time, exceed *Threeſcore*, a number leſs by *Forty*, than that of thoſe Biſhops of the Kingdom of *Naples* only, whoſe Proctors, together with all other Proctors of Biſhops, were excluded, even all along, from the Year 1545. when the *Council* firſt began, untill at leaſt 1562. the laſt before it ended.

3. Becauſe in it the *Italick* Nation alone concluded all the Nations of *Europe*, (I might ſay of the *World*) whether preſent or abſent; And this alſo was againſt another Precedent of the *Florentin Council*, and againſt the true primary intrinſick end of all *Councils*. Beſides it was diametrically oppoſite to the former courſe obſerv'd in thoſe very great and famous *Occidental* Synods of *Baſil* and *Conſtance*: for in them every *Nation* aſſembled by it ſelf, and in ſuch their national meetings apart, reſolved according to the number of Voices. But when all the *Nations* met together Conciliarly, the *General Deciſion* was eſtabliſht not by the ſuffrage of particular *Men*, but by the plurality of the Voices of the *Nations*.

Not *Free*. Becauſe all the *Members* of it, to a man, were ſworn Vaſſals to the *Pope*, by the ſtricteſt *Oath of fidelity* that could be drawn by Pen. And the *proponentibus Legatis*, and the continual directions by the *Mail*, and the number of *Titulars*, and *Penſioners*, and even *Renouncers*, hurried on a ſudden from the *Court* to the *Council*, and the Arch-Biſhop of *Oibanto*, with his forty ſure Seconds, and the place it ſelf of *Trent*, ſo much at the devotion of *Rome*; and many other, both fine *Devices*, and frightning *Menaces*, of the *Pope*, and of his *Legates* preſiding in the *Council*, might be added, were it neceſſary. But after that *Oath* once mentioned there needs no more be ſaid. It is not only an *Oath* that has been unknown to all *Chriſtian Biſhops* and *Churches*, for a whole thouſand years from *Chriſt* downwards; nor only an *Oath* that is repugnant to the duty of every good *Subject* on Earth, who is ſubject to any other *Prince*, or *State* beſides the *Pope*; but an *Oath* that tyrannizes over all freedom of Religion, Reaſon, Conſcience; an *Oath* that betrays all the *Chriſtian Churches* of the World to the lordly Will of one ſingle man: but therefore an *Oath* ſo neceſſary to the *Pope*, that being deſired to diſpence in it, with the Members of the *Council*, or at leaſt, to ſuſpend the obligation of it during the *Seſſions*; he expreſly refuſed to do either.

So that to a ſedate Conſiderer, at leaſt of all other Things and Circumſtances together with that *Oath*, it muſt appear, that ſince the ſecond *Epheſine* Council (that *Latrocinium* or *Synodus prædatoria*, as it is commonly called) wherein the good Patriarch *Flavianus* was wounded, impriſon'd, and fetterd; and the whole *Catholick* Party, through

through fear of the like bloody violence forced to ſubſcribe *Eutychianiſme*, there has never been held within the bounds of the *Latin Church* any which on the leaſt tolerable ground might challenge the name of *Oecumenical*, that was ſo far in all reſpects, from being *free*, as the Council of *Trent* was. The forementioned Council of *Florence* under *Eugenius* iv., and the other at *Lyons* under *Gregory* the x. were the only Councils held within that Time and Tract; which together with the Repreſentatives of the *Latin Church* had true *Members*, *Proxies* and *Legates* from the *Oriental* and other *Patriarchall* Churches of the *Greek* Communion, ſitting in them; aud therefore alſo were the only Councils held within that Time and Tract, which on the leaſt tolerable ground may challenge the name of *Oecumenical*. But it is manifeſt in *Hſtory*, that no Repreſentatives of the *Greek* Communion, in either of theſe two *Councils*, were by the aforeſaid, or any other *Oath*, or by any *Canon* which they owned, or in any other manner by any *Office* or *Benifice*, or *Title*, or any kind of *Church* or *State* preferment, bound to obſerve the dictates of the *Pope*. They were all of them perfectly *free* in both *Councils*, notwithſtanding that thoſe *Popes* themſelves, were perſonally preſent, *Gregory* at *Lyons*, and *Engenius* at *Florence*. And though compar'd to the *Latin Repreſentatives*, they were but very few in number; yet in weight and Vote, as to all the controverted Points, they were equal to the whole *Latin Church*. In the Council of *Trent* we have already ſeen, t'was far otherwiſe in both reſpects; there was neither *Side*, nor *Bench*, in it but of Men that were Bondmen to the *Pope*, as well by virtue of the foreſaid *Oath* of Vaſſallage made unto Him, as by reaſon of their manifold *dependencies* on him almoſt in all things, whether of this World or of the other: tho' it be confeſſed there were among them Thoſe, that took to heart their bondage and laboured all they durſt, to free themſelves and others from it; but all they durſt came to nothing. For at leaſt as to matter of *Reformation* (which if it had ſucceeded, was the only thing that could enfranchize them, as it was the only ſcope aimed at by thoſe *Princes* and *People*, who preſt ſo long and ſo hard for a *Council*,) it's clear, that one ſingle Vote of an hungry *Italian Paraſite*, or one ſingle Suffrage of any, (whether feared or zealous) *Papelin* whatſoever, above the preciſe number on the other ſide, weighed down the Scales; and ſilenced both ſides preſently, and left neither of them any more to ſay or do; ſuch was the great *Freedom*, and ſuch alſo was the great *Equity* of that *Council of Trent*. But ſurely neither the one nor the other was, by ten degrees, ſo little in the Synods of *Conſtance* and *Baſill*, nor in the *Florentine*, nor any other *Synod*, whether *Oecumenical*, or *Regional* juſtly ſo called.

Againſt

Againſt both *Pope* and *Trent*: She alledges that however they pretended to the ancient Rule, *Nihil innovandum, ſed quod traditum eſt obſervandum*; they held not to it. They had neither *Scripture* nor *Tradition* for them in any, but againſt them in many of their *Definitions*, and *Anathematiſms* pronounced againſt her Doctrine. Then ſhe inſiſts upon the Juſtice of her *Appeal*.

And in the firſt place to aſſert the lawfulneſs of appealing in ſuch a Cauſe and Caſe from the *Pope alone*, tho' it were ſuppoſed, he had otherwiſe had, by all the Laws of God and Man, a *Juriſdiction* over her: ſhe alledges 1. The Doctrine of the Schools againſt *Bulla Cœnæ*. 2. The Authority of the *Weſtern Church* in her Councils of *Conſtance* and *Baſil*, and *Sienа*, and *Piſa*, home enough to the Point. 3. Both the *Civil* and *Canon Law* and the Law of *Reaſon* too, and the *Popes* own determ'nations, purſuant to them all; as you may ſee at large in that Epiſtle of Pope *Nicholas* the firſt, to *Michael* the Emperour of *Conſtantinople*, which begins *Propoſucramus*, and * *Gratian* abbreviates, but *Binnius* has at * length.

See Tolet *in his* Inſtr. Sacred. lib. 1. cap. xx. num. 1.

* 3 *Qu.* 5. *cap. ſuſpecti.*

Then to aſſert the Lawfulneſs of Appealing from the *Pope and Trent* together; beſides the ground already laid, ſhe alledges other yet no leſs convincing *Arguments* from more antient times, even the *Doctrine* and *Practice* of thoſe very *Ages* and *Men* whom we all revere. She preſſes hard the old belief or perſuaſion of the *Fallibility* even of the moſt *Oecumenical Synods* truly ſuch, whatever the ſubject of their *Decrees* be; That neither in St. *Auſtin*'s days, nor before nor after for many Ages, the contrary Doctrine of their *Infallibility* was ſo much as heard of. That St. *Auſtin* himſelf moſt clearly declares himſelf for the former (*i. e.*) for the doctrine of their *Fallibility* and knows no other. And that whoſoever reads him *De Baptiſmo* againſt the *Donatiſts* muſt acknowledge this and ſomewhat more than this, if actual frequent Errors paſt of former plenary *Councils*, in the time paſt, be more than a pure potentiality of either. For his own expreſs words on this Subject are theſe; *Ipſaque plenaria Concilia ſæpe priora poſterioribus emendari, cum aliquo experimento rerum aperitur quod clauſum erat, & cognoſcitur quod latebat.* And for Expoſition of his meaning of the word *Plenaria*, theſe other; *Plenariorum Conciliorum Authoritati, quæ ſiunt ex univerſo orbe Chriſtiano.*

* Concil. Tom. 6. *from pag.* 415. *to* 499.

Auguſtin. de Baptiſm. *lib.* 2. *cap.* 3.

Quis autem neſciat ſacram ſcripturam Canonicam tam Veteris quam Novi Teſtamenti certis ſuis terminis contineri, eamque omnibus poſteoribus Epiſcoporum literis ita præponi, ut de illa omnino dubitari & diſceptari non poſſit, utrum, vel utrum veram rectumſit, quicquid in ea ſcriptum eſſe conſtiterit. Epiſcoporum autem literas quæ poſt confirmatum Canonem vel ſcriptæ ſunt, vel ſcribuntur, & per ſermonem forte ſapientiorem, cujuslibet in ea re pernitioris, & per aliorum Epiſcoporum graviorem authoritatem, doctiorumque prudentiam & per Concilia licere reprehendi, ſiquid in eis forte a veritate deviatum eſt: & ipſa Concilia, quæ per ſingulas Regiones vel Provincias ſunt, Plenariorum Conciliorum authoritati, quæ fiunt ex univerſo Orbe Chriſtiano ſine ullis ambagibus cedere: ipſaque plenaria concilia ſæpe priora poſterioribus emendari, cum aliquo experimento rerum aperitur quod clauſum erat, & cognoſcitur quod latebat; *ſine ullo typho ſacrilegæ ſuperbiæ, ſine ulla contentione lividæ invidiæ, cum ſancta humilitate, cum Pace catholica, cum Charitate Chriſtiana.*

She

She urges next the conſequentiall early practice of *Appeals*, and as for inſtances of it ſhe ſtrongly urges, that there can be nothing more obvious in the Hiſtory of the *Church*. For ſo did St. *Ignatius* appeal from the *Phocian* Council, and St. *Chryſoſtom* from the Council of *Quercum*, &c. and St. *Hillary* from *Ariminum*, and *Flavianus* from the ſecond *Epheſine*, and *Athanaſius* from the Council at *Tyre*, and *Cæcilian* of *Carthage* and his Ordainers, from that *African* Council held at *Carthage* under *Secundus Tingitanus* Primate of *Numidia* which depoſed him and them as *Traditors*. And ſo did all the ſeverall great numbers of other Biſhops, who in the reſpective cauſes, and ages, went along with thoſe holy Men, the cheif *Appellants* now named: and ſo did they appeal, ſome of them *in forma Juris Scripti*; others, *Via Facti & Rationis*: and ſome from *Regional*, others from *Patriarchal*, and others from thoſe *Oecumenical Synods* themſelves, which hapned to be either miſled by *ignorance*, or circumvented by *fraud*, or forced by *power*. And ſo did they in the one or other way appeal, ſome of them to greater, others to more indifferent *Councils*, and others to no *Council* at all: but either to the *Prince*, or to the *Pope*, or other *Biſhops*, and by them or any of them to the *diffuſive Church* her ſelf, (*Viz.*) when there was no likelyhood, no moral poſſibility of her meeting together in a juſt *Repreſentative* of Her, to decide the cauſe; or when they ſaw that the prevailing part, in ſuch a Repreſentative, was not likely at all to prove Orthodox. Even as thoſe other yet more early, and no leſs holy *Biſhops*, together with their *Churches* in the Third and Second Age, namely the *African Rebaptizers* with *Cyprian*, and the *Oriental Quartadecimans* with *Policrates* (of whom I have ſpoken before tho' upon another occaſion) ſeeing themſelves cenſur'd, condemned, excommunicated by their fellow Biſhops of *Rome*, *Stephen* and *Victor*, to whom they owed no Subjection at all, did, in the latter way only (*i. e.*) *Via Facti & Rationis* by their Letter to other *Biſhops*, and full account given of themſelves and Hope that was in them, appeal to the Judgment of all men whatſoever, able to underſtand the merits of their cauſe, and thereby did both undeceive other *Churches* and ſatisfy their own Conſcience, and contain their own Flocks in due obedience; maugre all the attempts of *Rome* to the contrary.

And ſo, ſays the *Church of England*, ſhe has appeald *Via facti & rationis*, both from the *Pope* and Council of *Trent*, to the diffuſive *Church of Chriſt* whereever on Earth. She ſaw it was not fit for her to appeal from them *Via Juris Scripti*, being She acknowledged no ſubjection due from her to either of them, or both together; withall ſhe ſaw, there was no reaſon for appealing either in the one or other way, to the Repreſentative *Catholick Church* in a *Council*, truly *Oecumenical*

menical, becauſe the impoſſibility for the Members of the *five* great *Patriark-ſhips* to meet together was too apparent, and therefore ſhe has appeald to that judgment of *Diſcretion*, which all and every of all the Repreſentable Members of the *diffuſive Church* may challenge. And ſhe ceaſes not to do ſo ſtill, even by as many publick declarations as there are by Her authority learned Books, in vindication of Her, and of every particular of Her Doctrine ſet out in Print, from the beginning of the *Reformation* to this very time.

And farther yet, to anſwer all prejudices in general, whether of *Hereſie* or *Schiſm*, entertaind againſt Her by the leſs conſidering party of *Roman Catholicks*, ſhe alledges *five* things more.

1. That ſhe has neither been the Author, nor is the continuer of the *Schiſm*, between the *Church of Rome* and Her; but found it made by Him that excommunicated and interdicted the *Roman Catholicks* of *England*, both *Clergie* and *People* in the Reign of *Henry* VIII. and ſees it continued ever ſince by the ſucceeding Biſhops of *Rome*.

2. That as to the charge of *Hereſie* on Her, or any of her Doctrines, ſhe has ever profeſt to ſtand or fall, not only by the Rule of *Canonical Scripture*, but Authority of *Univerſal Tradition*. (*i. e.*) ſuch Tradition as will abide that old Teſt, whereof *Vincentius Lyrinenſis* ſpeaks, namely; *Quod ſemper, quod ubique, quod apud omnes*.

3. That notwithſtanding her greateſt ſubmiſſion be only to an *Oecumenical Synod* truly ſo called, as to the moſt credible Witneſſes, and higheſt Authority (of any living) upon Earth, in matters of *Chriſtian Faith*; and notwithſtanding alſo, that her perſwaſion of the *Fallibility* of all *Synods*, how *General* ſoever, can be no firmer then it is: yet her deſire of *Peace* among the *Churches of Chriſt* hath always been ſo greatly earneſt, that ſeeing the preſent extent of the *Mahumetan* Empire, while it laſteth, muſt render all expectations of a true *Oecumenical Synod* vain; She has from the beginning offer'd and does ſtill moſt heartily offer to put all matters both of *Hereſie* and *Schiſm*, and all other differences whatſoever, between the Church of *Rome* and Her, to a determination of a full and free *Council* of the *Occidental Church* alone, and (which muſt be conſequentiall) to acquieſce therein ſo far at leaſt, as concerns the external Court of Man, untill a plenary Council or a *Concilium Orbis Terrarum* (as St. *Auſtin* calls it) may convene.

4. That to the end neither ſide, in ſuch a Council (of the *Weſtern Church* alone) may be able to fruſtrate the expectations of all good men; it has been always her deſire, that the *Emperour of Germany*, and other *Kings* and *States of Europe*, diſcharge in it by themſelves preſent, or when abſent, by their Great Commiſſioners of Lay profeſſion

feſſion the place and part of *Conſtantin* the Great in the *Nicene* Council, or *Theodoſius* in the *Epheſine*, or *Martianus* and *Pulcheria*, (or thoſe appointed by them who were ſtiled *Judices Glorioſiſſimi*) in the Synod of *Chalcedon*.

5. That ſeeing the *Church of Rome* has continually declined this fair way of Tryal, and that from the beginning of the breach, there has been no poſſibility of any other rational way of coming to an iſſue: then certainly all indifferent lookers on muſt ſee, where the preſumption of guilt, (whether of *Hereſie*, or *Schiſm*, or both, or either) lies. For among all judicious unconcerned Men, it has ever been an allowed Suppoſition, that in ſuch fatal Diviſions of the *Church*, that ſide muſt be thought obnoxious, that declines the *Tryal* before indifferent Judges.

So much in ſhort, and much more at length, even in relation to the external Court of Man, doth the preſent *Church of England* inſiſt upon, as her general and perpetual plea in defence of Her ſelf, and her Doctrines from any ſtain, either of *Hereſie* or *Schiſm*, or other condemnation by the *Catholick Church*, notwithſtanding any ſentence of the preſent *Church of Rome*, or Biſhops of that See, or Council of *Trent* to the contrary.

But I forbear enlarging farther on a Subject ſo forreign to the ſcope of all my former diſcourſe. For be the cauſe of *Trent* and *Rome* and *England* and her Doctrines, and their condemnation of her Doctrines whatſoever you pleaſe, in order to the *external Judicatorie* of man, or *viſible Church*, and cenſures and puniſhments of this Life: we have ſeen already, that in order to the *internal Judicatorie* of God or *inviſible Church*, and Communion of Saints and rewards of the other Life; it is, for ought mortal man does know, far otherwiſe than you ſay it is.

And this being evidently true, I hope you will pardon me, if therefore now, in the *Concluſion* of all, I demand of you, Why ſo peremptory in your Cenſures, *Friend?* why ſo poſitive in your Judgment? and wherefore a Doom ſo cruel to Man? ſo injurious to God Himſelf? or how dare you, or how can you adjudge to Eternal Death ſo numberleſs a number of Souls believing on *Chriſt*, and hoping in him, whoſe Names, for ought you know, may be written in the Book of Life? O *friend!* is this to anſwer the Apoſtle *Pauls* rebuking queſtion to you, *Tu quis es qui judicas alienum ſervum?* is this to conſider his reaſon immediately following in thoſe other words, *Domino ſuo ſtat aut cadit: ſtabit autem; potens eſt enim Deus ſtatuere illum?* is this to regard his general admonition elſewhere to all Chriſtians (viz.) *not to judge before that time when the Lord ſhall come and diſcover the hidden things of* 1 Cor. 4. 5.

darkneſs and manifeſt the Counſels of Hearts, and render praiſe to every one that deſerves it? or is it ſo much as to revere *Chriſt* himſelf commanding us *not to judge*, (viz.) raſhly of others, or of any inviſible concern of theirs? Ah *Sir*! theſe are *Queſtions*, which I fear, may be dreadfull to you another day, if you ſlight them in this day of yours: and yet, after all, I bear you witneſs (as the Apoſtle did to his Countrymen the *Jews*) that you have *a zeal of God*, tho' (as to the particular in debate) *not according to Knowledge.*

Matth. 7. 1.

Sed manum de Tabula: I will enlarge no further now upon this Subject. I have given, what in my opinion is ſufficient here againſt your *Hypotheſis*. And by conſequence I have declared my naked thoughts of the main of your Book againſt Dr. *Sall*, and by doing ſo, I have obeyed your own particular commands to me, to that purpoſe. If any where the freedom of my expreſſions be not ſuitable to the diſtance of my condition from yours, or to the deference I owe you, be pleaſed to remember it was your ſelf, that incouraged me to it and pardon'd me for it, before hand. So much I know of my own mind, that tho' the Liberty of *Hierom* a Preſbiter in writing to *Auſtin* a Biſhop (concerning the reprehenſion of *Peter* the firſt of the Apoſtles by *Paul* the laſt and leaſt of them, as he calls Himſelf) might peradventure have patroniz'd my imitation of Him, when I write to you in matters no leſs important nor leſs conteſted between us: Yet I would not have ventured on it without your own expreſs leave.

By this time perhaps you may remember, that in my *laſt Letter* I promiſed to give you of Dr. *Sall* (the occaſioner of your *Book* and this *Letter*:) ſomewhat more then I ſaid then. Know therefore that within ſome few days after (to be as good as my word) I found out his Lodging, and ſpent a great part of eight days in his Company, and put him many queſtions about himſelf, and ſome matter of Fact, which hapned before, and in, and ſince his Change. And that He on the other ſide was (for ought I could perceive) as willing to anſwer, as I to demand. Among other things he told me at large the cauſe of your Kindneſs to Him and great Concern for Him. He told me alſo that in caſe He had not left the *Roman Communion*, he had nevertheleſs reſolved to leave the *Jeſuits Order*, and this for ſome, as well *Doctrines*, as *Practices* maintained by, if not peculiar to, that *Society*. And yet withall He averred to me, that neither his own *Order*, nor any other Order or Perſon of the *Roman Church* had ever offended Him or given Him, by any ſuch offence, the leaſt occaſion of quitting their *Communion*. That only his reading, and this alſo in our *Schoolmen*, was it that changed his judgment; and that no earthly conſideration, but the irreſiſtible power of *Truth* and the in-

inſupportable tortures of thoſe *Ictus* and *Laniatus* of Conſcience, which muſt be at long running the unhappy Conqueſt of all that continue *Rebels againſt the Light*, made Him reſolve at laſt, and in point of external *Profeſſion of Faith* or *Communion of Sacraments*, exchange the preſent *Church of Rome* for the preſent *Church of England*. He moreover told me that He had no thoughts of anſwering your *Book*, but would aſſuredly *J.S.* his Book though He knew not the Author, but thought Him to be *John Sergeant*, a ſecular Preiſt of Note among the *Roman Catholick Engliſh Clergie*. And this is all, I remember now of his diſcourſe. Soon after he departed for *Dublin*, where I ſuppoſe He has been hard at ſtudy ever ſince. For though I have no Correſpondence with Him in any manner, nor enquired, nor heard of him all this while; yet I can tell you this is but the 4th. day, ſince I ſaw by chance a fair Manuſcript come hither from Him (but ſome days before) to be printed, in anſwer to three ſeveral *Books* writ againſt Him: the one by *J. S.* the other by *J. C.* and the third by *N. N.* I had no leaſure to look into it; but only to ſee the *Title Page*, whereby I ſaw (however) that in reference to your *Book* he entertained new thoughts after departing hence.

Rebelles Lumini Job 24. 13.

God of his infinite Mercy grant that our *Controverſial* thoughts on every ſide may center at laſt in *Truth*, and end at laſt in *Happineſs*! I am ſure they are in themſelves, at beſt no other then Vexations and Afflictions of Spirit. But what ſhall we ſay, or ſhall we anſwer in the words of *Solomon? This ſore trouble hath God given to the Sons of Men to be exercis'd therewith.* Our comfort is that it will not be ſo for ever. We know that *When he ſhall appear, We ſhall be like to him; becauſe we ſhall ſee Him as He is*: and ſeeing *him*, what is it that We ſhall not ſee? *Quid eſt quod ibi non vident qui videntem omnia vident*, ſaid *Gregory* the Great: if there be any thing more, we are certain not to be concerned in it. But then, on the contrary, if our unfortunate checking here the *light of Conſcience* within us, ſhould there deprive us of ſeeing that *Light of Lights* and ſupereſſential fountain of all Lights, what ſhall become of us? *O thou Keeper of Men* prevent this dreadfull IF! O thou that *deſireſt all men to be ſaved, and* for that end *to come to the Knowledge of the truth!* O thou that *Rejoyceſt not in the deſtruction of the Living*, but in their correction and amendment, * *hic URE, hic SECA, ut in æternum parcas*; here burn, here cut, that thou mayeſt ſpare for ever.

Eccleſ. 1. 13.
1 John 3. 2.
Job 7. 20.
1 Tim. 2. 4.
Sap. 1. 13.
* Auguſt.

And thus, *moſt Honoured Sir*, powring out my Soul to God in heartieſt prayers, for us all on every ſide; and not doubting, you will, in a more powerfull manner, ſay *Amen* to it; I kiſs your hands with all due reſpects and veneration.

London the 13th. of *March*
1676. *N. S.*

Your moſt humble and affectionate Servant.

The Biſhop of *Winton*'s

LETTER

IN

Anſwer to the Letter of the Roman Prieſt *to him*; *together with his Judgment upon the foregoing Letter, ſent by the ſaid* Prieſt *to the Biſhop of* Ferns.

SIR,

I Muſt firſt beg your pardon for having no ſooner acknowledged my receiving thoſe two *Papers*, of which I deſired you to ſend me a Copy: from which deſire of mine you do very truly conclude, that I did approve of them; for indeed I did ſo. And I am glad (rather for your ſake than mine own) that you value my Judgment ſo much, and ſeem to be ſo well pleaſed with it, as to deſire me to give you my Opinion concerning a third *Paper* of yours alſo; which you had ſent me before, and did not deſire to be returned. I mean that long Letter of yours to the Biſhop of *Fernes*, which I have read over and over again; and that not only with great Satisfaction to *my ſelf* in point of *Judgment*, but with great Concernment for *you* in point of *Affection* alſo. For from that *Letter* of yours to the Biſhop, and from another of yours to me (which I received at the ſame time) I am very much confirmed in the hope I have always had (ſince I have been thoroughly ac-

quainted with you) of your coming over, and of your coming over without delay or heſitation, to that *Church*, for which, in the aforeſaid *Letter* of yours to that Biſhop, you have made ſo ample and ſo excellent an *Apology* in general, and particularly in the perſon and behalf of Dr. *Sall*, a very ſufficient Apology likewiſe for the coming over of any from the *Church of Rome* to the *Church of England*, that are ſo perſuaded of both Churches as *He* is; and as (I verily believe) *You* are alſo. And for this hope of mine in relation to you, methinks there is ground enough from many ſeveral paſſages in your aforeſaid *Letters* to that Biſhop, and to me: from ſeveral paſſages of which two *Letters* compared one with another, and put together, I think I may rationally infer theſe three *Concluſions*, (*viz.*)

I. That being ſo perſuaded as you are, you cannot with a good Conſcience, nor conſequently without endangering the loſs of your own Soul (and perhaps of many other Souls beſides your own) continue in the Communion of the preſent *Church of Rome*.

II. That being ſo perſuaded as you are, you are obliged both in Conſcience and in Prudence to joyn in Communion with the *Church of England*.

III. That being obliged to quit the Communion of the *One*, and joyn in Communion with the *Other*, You are obliged in Conſcience ſpeedily, publickly, and reſolutely to declare you do ſo.

I. For

I. For proof of the *Firſt* of theſe *Aſſertions*, we are to premiſe, that the *Church of Rome*, and *Communion* with it, may be conſidered according to three ſeveral diſtinct *Periods* of time, according to the differences of its reſpective Eſtate and Conſtitution, and conſequently, according to the different Obligation, or diſobligation of *Communion* with it, during thoſe ſeveral times or periods of time.

1. By the *firſt Period* of time I mean all that ſpace or duration of Years (how many or how few ſoever they were; which I will not at preſent undertake to examine) wherein the *Church of Rome* continued in that *Faith*, which was at firſt, and once for all (as St. *Jude* tells us) *delivered to the Saints*, that is, to all *Primitive Chriſtians*, by the *Apoſtles* and *Apoſtolical men* who were their firſt Teachers; amongſt which *Primitive Chriſtians* it muſt be confeſſed, that thoſe of *Rome* were very eminent, inſomuch that *their Faith was ſpoken of throughout the whole World*; as St. *Paul* tells us *Rom.* i. 8. which yet by the way is no more then what the Apoſtle ſaith of the Faith of the *Theſſalonians* at the ſame time; nor no more perhaps than he might have ſaid of any other *Chriſtian Church* then in being. So that *then*, and as long after as the *Church of Rome* continued in the Integrity of that *Doctrine* which ſhe then profeſſed, and in the Purity of that *Worſhip* which ſhe then practiſed; All other *Chriſtians* and *Chriſtian Churches* in the World did hold, and were obliged to hold *Communion* with her; though not

1 *Theſ.* i. 8.

by way of *Subordination* to her, as their Head, or as to the Mother and Miſtreſs of all Churches, as ſhe now calls her ſelf: but by way of *Coordination* or *Aſſociation* only, as Siſters or Daughters, Churches of the ſame Mother, *viz.* the *Church Catholique*: or as Fellow-Members under the ſame Head, the Lord *Chriſt Jeſus*. During this period of time therefore, not to be of, or to ſeparate from, the Communion of the *Church of Rome*, was to be guilty of *Hereſie*, or *Schiſm*, or both, as firſt the *Novatians*, and afterwards the *Donatiſts* were: becauſe to break off Communion with the Church of *Rome*, and to break off Communion with the whole *Catholick Church* of *Chriſt*, was then one and the ſame thing.

2. By the *ſecond Period* of time I mean all that intervall of Ages from the Church of *Romes* beginning to fall from her Primitive Purity and Integrity both in *Doctrine* and *Worſhip*, until the time of *Leo* the Tenth, or until the Councils of *Lateran* and *Trent*. Which Interval of time reckoning from the firſt *Pope*, who took upon him the title of *Univerſal Biſhop*, to the aforeſaid Pope and Councils, amounts to little leſs than a thouſand years. Perhaps we might date this Account a *Century* or two higher, that is from preſently after the *fifth* or rather the *fourth General Council*; when the Doctrine of *Purgatory* and of *Invocation* of *Saints* began to be talked of, though not as Matters of Faith, but as Pious and

and probable Opinions only. But (as I ſaid before) I intend not to inſiſt upon an exact Calculation of times, either as to the continuance of the Church of *Rome* in its firſt purity, or as to its beginning to decline from it: For the *Tares* were ſown while men ſlept, and they were ſown before they came up; and ſome were ſown at one time and came up, and ſome at another, till at length all the *good Corn* that was at firſt ſown in the Field of the *Church*, was in danger to be overgrown and choaked up by them: whilſt the *Husbandmen* (that is the Governours of the Church) were not only aſleep when they ſhould have hinderd the ſowing of them; but afterwards when they were awake, and knew well enough what they did, they did not only ſuffer but cheriſh the growth of them, though they knew them to be *Tares*; that is, ſuch Doctrines as were not taught by *Chriſt* and his *Apoſtles*, but ſuch as were the Inventions and Traditions of men; ſome of them at firſt perhaps out of a pious intention, and in order to a good end; but all or moſt of them ſuch, as might be and afterwards were made uſe of by crafty and ambitious men to ſerve for ſecular and worldly deſigns, namely for the ſetting up of another *Kingdom* or Soveraign power in the *Church*, beſides that of *Chriſts*, nay above that of *Chriſts*; as in effect that of the *Pope* is in that part of the Church wherein he governs at this day.

And to this end, I mean to the advancing and ſupporting the Grandeur and Tyrany of the *Papal Monarchy*;

Monarchy; have all thoſe additionals to the *Creed* and *Practice* of the *Primitive Chriſtians* been made uſe of, with what intention or by what means, or in what manner, or at what time ſoever they were brought into the Church; as the Doctrine and Practice of *Invocation of Angels and Saints*, of *Adoration of Images*, of *Purgatory*, of *Indulgences*, of *Maſſes* and *Dirges* for the dead, of *Auricular Confeſſion*, of the *Celibate of Prieſts*, of the *Exemption of the Clergy from Secular Juriſdiction*, and of all *Regulars* from *Epiſcopal* Juriſdiction alſo, of the *Popes power of Diſpenſing with Oaths*, with *Marriages* and all other *Vows and Contracts*, nay of *Depoſing of Kings*, and *Diſpoſing of Kingdoms*, and laſtly of the Popes being *Univerſal Biſhop* or *Head* of the whole *Chriſtian Church*. Whereunto might be added the Doctrine of *Tranſubſtantiation*, with all the abſurd and blaſphemous Conſequences of it, eſpecially the Idolatrous Adoration of the Conſecrated Elements of *Bread* and *Wine*: as likewiſe the Doctrine of the neceſſity of the *Prieſts intention* to make the Sacraments effectual, and conſequently that there is not, nor ever can be ſo much as a *Moral certainty* that there ever was, is, or ever will be, *Pope*, or *Biſhop*, or *Prieſt*, or *Chriſtian* in the World. And becauſe there is no mention of all or any of theſe additional *Doctrines* or *Practices* in *Scripture* or *Written word* of God, there is another *Doctrine* which they lay for a Foundation, not only of all thoſe Doctrines which they have added already, but of all other Doctrines or Practices

ctiſes that they ſhall, as they ſee cauſe, be pleaſed to add hereafter; and that is the Doctrine of a Word of God *Unwritten*, delivered they know not *when*, *by* they know not *whom*, to they know not *whom*, and kept they know not *where*, to be made uſe of as occaſion ſerves: it being indeed an unknown, and an inexhauſtible Treaſury of *Doctrines* to be improved and impoſed, *how* and *when* it ſhall pleaſe the *Pope*, upon thoſe that have faith enough to believe them: as the Saints *works of Superrogation* are an unknown and an inexhauſtible Treaſury of *Merits* for thoſe that want merits of their own, and have monyes enough to buy them. But becauſe, as none of the aforeſaid *Doctrines* or *Practices* are to be found in the *Written word* of God; ſo ſome of them ſeem to be directly and expreſly contrary to the written word of God; as *worſhipping of Images*, and *invocation of Angels and Saints*, (whereunto might be added *Prayer in an unknown Tongue*, and *withholding the Cup from the Laity* in the Sacrament) and becauſe it would be ſcandalous, if the People ſhould perceive there is ſuch a contrariety betwixt the *Word written*, and the *Word unwritten*, both of them being pretended to be equally the word of the ſame God, in whom as there is *no change*, *nor ſhadow of turning*, ſo there is no contrariety, nor ſhadow of varying from himſelf in his Word neither; therefore to hinder this diſcovery, and to make what they liſt to be believed and practiſed by the People, they have one Doctrine more very neceſſary

in-

in order to this, and all other their by-Ends and Designs, which is this, that the *Reading of Scriptures* or written word of God *ought not to be allowed to the Laity, or to any but such as shall be licensed to read them*, which are to be none but such as are not likely to make ill use of them: that is, in their sence, by being convinced either to believe, or disbeleive any thing more, or less, or otherwise, then as *that Church* teacheth.

And this was (generally speaking) the Constitution of the *Church of Rome*, at least, for the major part of the aforesaid *Second period* of time, during its declination from its first faith; by adding *new Articles* to its first *Creed*, all of them supernumerary to it, and some of them destructive of it, and likewise by introducing *new Objects*, and *new Ways of worship*, some of them *Superstitious*, and some of them not *Superstitious* only, but *Heathenish* and *Idolatrous* also: but not all of them at once, either of the one sort, or of the other; I mean, either as to matter of *Doctrine*, or matter of *Worship*; but some of both sorts sooner, and some later; and most of them from being at first but the *Opinions* and *practices* of *private* men, grew at length to be incorporated into the body of their *Divinity*, and to be intruded into their *publick Worship*, and become *partes integrantes* of their *Liturgy* it self; but not without great opposition from very many Eminent persons, both for *Learning* and *Piety*, of their own *Communion*, in several *Ages* of the aforesaid *Period*; as may appear by

by what Dr. *Feild* Dean of *Glouceſter* (a very Learned and Judicious Divine of the Church of *England*) hath obſerved in his *Appendix* to the third Book *of the Church*; from whence he concludes, that it was rather a predominant *faction* in the Church of *Rome*, then the *Church* it ſelf that did uphold, and maintain the aforeſaid *Doctrines* and *Practices* in order to the maintaining and upholding of the power and grandeur of the *Papacy*. And therefore he concludes likewiſe that it is not to be doubted of but that many thouſands of our *Fore-Fathers*, who lived and died in the Communion of the Church of *Rome*, even after, and whilſt the aforeſaid Corruptions in *doctrine* and *worſhip* were generally beleived and practiſed, might be, and were ſaved. *Firſt* becauſe, it was not then a neceſſary condition of *Communion* with that Church to *believe*, much leſs to *profeſs* the beleif of all, nor perhaps any of the aforeſaid *Doctrines*; as appears by many learned men's publickly oppoſing of them. *Secondly*, Becauſe of thoſe that did *believe* and *profeſs* the beleif of them many, very many did it in the ſimplicity of their hearts, becauſe they were born and bred in that beleif, and had no means to inform and convince them of the *Errors* they were in: and therefore, notwithſtanding the continuing in thoſe *Errors* even unto their death, yet beleiving thoſe other Goſpel *ſaving Truths*, which were even then, and are ſtill, taught and believed in that Church, and living a ſerious and conſcientious Life (as far as the

light they had would direct, and humane frailty permit, them to do) they might through the mercy of God pardoning their *Errors*, and accepting of their pious *Performances*, and *Intentions* together with an *actual Repentance* of their *known*, and an *habitual Repentance* of their *unknown* Sins, be ſaved; but not *quia*, or *quatenus*, but *quamvis* They lived and died in the *belief* and *practice* of the aforeſaid Errors in *Doctrine* and erroneous ways of *Worſhip*. Whereunto may be added in the *third* place, by way of Excuſe for thoſe that continued in the Communion of *that Church*, during this *ſecond Period* of time, though they were convinced of the aforeſaid *Errors*, both in *Doctrine* and *Worſhip*, and conſequently of the Danger they were in by ſo doing; yet they could not tell *whither*, or to what *viſible Church* to go to, at leaſt in theſe *weſtern* parts of the World, if they ſeparated themſelves from the *Church of Rome*: and therefore they were fain to continue in it, while ſome of them (as I ſaid before) did openly oppoſe and complain of it, others did ſilently groan under the Corruption they did ſeemingly comply with in it.

3. But now, if we conſider the *Church of Rome* as it is in its *third* or laſt *Period*, which I date from the Councils of *Lateran* and *Trent*, (I mean the Council of *Lateran* under *Leo* the 10th.) we ſhall find it to be quite another thing, then it was before, even when it was at the worſt, and conſequently the

the *Communion* with it, to be quite another thing then it was before alſo.

For *Firſt*, as our *Crackenthorp* in his *Vigilius dormitans* obſerves, though their *Doctrines*, (which he calls the *materiale* of their Church) be ſtill the ſame they were before in the *ſecond Period* yet the *Foundation* whereon they were built, or the ultimate reaſon for which they are to be believed (which he calls the *formale* of their Church) is quite changed. Becauſe, whereas before the Council of *Lateran*, the laſt Reſolutions of Debates and Controverſies in *matters of faith*, were into the *Word of God* and *Primitive Tradition*, declared to be ſo by the Decrees of *General Councils*; whereunto the *Popes* themſelves were to be ſubject: now, ſince by the Council of *Lateran*, the *Pope* is decree'd and declared to be above all *General Councils*; the laſt Reſolutions of all Doubts and Diſputes in matters of Faith, are to be finally determined by the ſentence of the *Pope*: which ſentence of the *Popes* in a cauſe of Faith whoſoever gainſayth, he is none of their Church ſaith *Greg. de Valentia*, but an Heretick ſaith *Stapleton*, *Canus*, and *Bellarmine*, as *Cracanthorp* quotes them; becauſe, though perhaps he may and doth believe the *matter of Faith*, which the *Pope* hath determined; yet he doth not believe it *Sub illa formali ratione*; for which all matters of Faith, that are or may be doubted of, are to be believed: namely, becauſe the *Pope* (who is the laſt and ſupream *Judge of Controverſies*) hath ſo determined it.

So that in effect, the laſt Reſolution of all *Faith* in the preſent Church of *Rome*, is not into the *Word of God*; but into the Word of the *Pope*; becauſe, though we are to believe what *God* ſaith, becauſe God ſaith it; yet we are to believe that God ſaith it, becauſe the *Pope* ſaith that God ſaith it by determining what *Books* are, and what are not, *Canonical*; and by determining likewiſe what is and what is not the true *Sence* or meaning of ſuch Books, or any part of ſuch Books as he determines to be *Canonical*. The very *Foundation of Faith* therefore in the *Church of Rome* is quite changed from what it was before, even in the moſt corrupt times; and conſequently it is quite another *Church* then it was formerly. And therefore, whereas thoſe of the preſent Church of *Rome* ask us *where was our Church* before *Luther?* we may, with much more reaſon, ask them, where was this Church of *theirs* before *Luther?* for *Luther* was contemporary with the *Lateran* Council, which laid the foundation of the preſent Church of *Rome*, in regard of the *Formale*, though not of the *Materiale* of it: and you know that it is *forma* that *dat eſſe rei*.

But 2*ly*. Though there be ſtill the ſame *Materiale* or the ſame materials for matter of *Doctrine* and *Worſhip* in the preſent Church of *Rome*, as there were before in the *ſecond Period*; as namely, *Invocation of Saints*, *Adoration of Images*, and the reſt I have before named; yet the *explicite* and profeſſed belief of them was not required as a neceſſary

Con-

Condition of Communion with that Church *then*, as it is with this Church *now*. For as I ſaid before, there were many in the Church of *Rome* before the *Lateran* and *Trent* Councils, and thoſe very Eminent both in *Learning* and *Authority*, that did not only queſtion the truth of many of the aforeſaid Doctrines, but publiquely declared their diſſent from them, and their judgment againſt them; and yet were nevertheleſs accounted very good *Catholicks*: much leſs were any of them obliged by Oath to *anathematize* all that did not believe all or any of thoſe Doctrines, as they are now obliged, ſince the Council of *Trent*, by the Bull of *Pius* the 4th. annexed to the Decrees of that Council, and called *Forma juramenti profeſſionis fidei*; with which profeſſion of faith, as it is there ſet down, if you cannot cordially and conſcientiouſly comply in all particulars, I cannot ſee how with a good Conſcience you can continue in the Communion of the preſent *Church of Rome*; which exacts ſuch a profeſſion of Faith from all ſuch (as you are) as a condition of her *Communion*.

Let us ſee therefore, whether you being ſo perſwaded as you (by what you have written to *Me* and to the Biſhop of *Ferns*) ſeem to be, can cordially and conſcientiouſly make ſuch a *Profeſſion of Faith* or no.

I think you cannot, For to ſay nothing at preſent of the ſeveral *particulars* therein ſpecified (as the Doctrine of *Tranſubſtantiation*, of *Purgatory*, of *Invocation of Saints*) which you are to ſwear you believe: you are to ſwear likewiſe in the *General*, that you do *indubitanter recipere, & profiteri cætera omnia a S. Sanctis Canonibus, & Oecumenicis Conciliis, ac præcipue a ſacroſancta Synodo Tridentina, definita, & declarata; ſimulque contraria omnia, atque hæreſes quaſcunque ab Eccleſia damnatas, rejectas, & Anathematizatas, damnare, rejicere, & Anathematizare.* And which is the worſt of all, you muſt ſwear too, *Hanc eſſe veram fidem Catholicam, extra quam nemo ſalvus eſſe poteſt*; and that you will as much as in you lyes, make it to be believed by others alſo: and conſequently that you do your ſelf believe, and will do what you can, to make others to believe likewiſe, that all that have not the ſame Faith, or do not believe ſo as the *Oath* enjoyns them to believe, muſt be damned. Which what is it elſe but the very thing you ſo ſmartly reprove the Biſhop of *Ferns* for? or what is the main drift and ſcope of all that long *Letter* you writ to him, but to convince him of the *Falſehood* as well as of the *Uncharitableneſs* of that Cenſure of his, *That none but thoſe that believe as the preſent Church of* Rome *believes can be ſaved:* and conſequently that Dr. *Sall.*, by leaving the *Communion* of that *Church*, is for ſo doing, and as long as he continues ſo to do in a damnable condition; as all others, whether Men

or

or Churches are, who are not of that *Communion*: which is no more than what every man by the aforeſaid *Profeſſion of Faith*, is bound to believe of all that do not profeſs the ſame Faith. And therefore you muſt either renounce the *Profeſſion* of the ſaid Faith or you muſt pronounce the ſame ſevere *Cenſure*, not only upon Dr. *Sall*, but upon the whole *Church of England*, and all other *Churches* diſſenting, or divided from the preſent *Church of Rome*: But this you cannot do without retracting all you have written to the Biſhop of *Ferns*, and that I am ſure you will not do becauſe in your *Letter* to me, you tell me that what you writ to that Biſhop in the aforeſaid *Letter*, was *that which you thought was true, and what it became you to ſay to a Man that deſir'd your judgment.* And becauſe to induce him to believe you that it was indeed your judgment, you tell him in one place that *you hold it an obligation of Conſcience on you not to maintain any Principles or Practices which according to the inward conviction of your own proper Soul appear to you Erroneous and Wicked*; and in another place you tell him likewiſe that you hold it a ſin againſt the Holy-Ghoſt *veritatem agnitam impugnare*: Of which the *former*, as I conceive and by the drift and proceſs of the Diſcourſe it ſelf appears, is ſaid by you in reference to ſome *Principles* and *Practices* in the *Church of Rome* which you cannot defend; and the *latter* in reference to *Orthodoxie*, or *Catholick* ſaving *Truth*, which you cannot chuſe but acknowledge

ledge to be profeſſed in the *Church of England*. And firſt that by theſe *Opinions* and *Practices*, which appearing to you to be *Erroneous* and *Wicked*, you cannnot maintain; you mean ſome *Erroneous Opinions* and *Wicked Practices* upheld and maintain'd in the *Church of Rome*, it appears by the firſt of your Letters to the aforeſaid Biſhop, (wherein indeed that ſaying of yours is) whereof the main drift and ſcope is to prove that the lawfulneſs of *taking up Arms againſt the King for Religion*, is an Erroneous Opinion, and the Practice of it Wicked and Rebellious, as you ſay that was in *Ireland*; notwithſtanding the *Pope* by his *Nuntio* did authorize it: and therefore you are not to wonder that you are Excommunicated for your writing againſt it; as likewiſe for your writing againſt other of their Erroneous *Principles* and *Practices*, as that of *Exemption of the Clergy* from the Juriſdiction of the Civil Magiſtrate, which *Suarez* affirms to be *de Fide*; and the Popes Power of *depoſing of Kings for Hereſie*, or *in ordine ad ſpiritualia*; which though it hath not (for ought I know) been defined by any *Council*, yet it hath been often aſſerted, and declared by the *Pope*, whoſe Authority hath been defined by a Council to be above all Councils; and therefore by the aforeſaid characteriſtical *Profeſſion of Faith* (if you are or mean to continue in the *Communion* of the preſent Church of *Rome*) you are bound to *believe* and *profeſs* you believe He is ſo, and to *Anathematize* all that believe the contrary.

And

And then how dare you to ſpeak (as you do in your *ſecond Letter* to *Ferns*) of appealing from the *Pope* to a *General Council?* or how can you excuſe the *Church of England* (as you do,) from being either *Heretical* or *Schiſmatical?* if you do believe (as by the aforeſaid *profeſſion of faith* you are bound to believe) that all thoſe are *Hereticks* or *Schiſmaticks*, that the *Church of Rome* hath declared to be ſo, or if you believe the not being in *Communion* with the *Church of Rome* to be *Schiſm*, or the not believing all or any of thoſe *Articles* or *Doctrines* (wherein the Church of *England* diſſents from the Church of *Rome*) to be *Hereſie*. It is plain therefore that you do not believe thoſe *Doctrines* to be *de Fide*, which the Church hf *Rome* hath defin'd to be *de Fide*: nor that to be *Hereſie* and *Schiſm* which the Church of *Rome* hath defin'd to be *Hereſie* and *Schiſm*; and therefore it is plain likewiſe that you do not, that you cannot *indubitanter recipere & profiteri omnia a Sacroſancta Synodo Tridentina definita & declarata; ſimulque contraria omnia, atque Hereſes quas cunque ab Eccleſia (in iſta ſcilicet Synodo) damnatas & rejectas & anathematizatas damnare, rejicere, & anathematizare:* much leſs can you or dare you ſay that the faith, the *profeſſion* whereof is there made and ſworn to, is the true Catholique Faith, *extra quam nemo ſalvus eſſe poteſt*; and conſequently it is evident upon the whole matter, that you do not, that you cannot believe as the preſent Church of *Rome* believes: and there-

fore you are not really and indeed of her *Communion*, though you do profeſs your ſelf to be ſo. But not to inſiſt on *Inferences* only, do not you in plain terms ſay in that *Letter* of yours to me, that you think the *Roman Churches anathematizing other Churches, on the ſole account of the late controverted Doctrines, cannot be excuſed from rending the Catholick Church of Chriſt?* and muſt you not then think that it is the *Church of Rome* that rends, and not other Churches that are rent by her that is the *Schiſmatical* party? whereunto if you had added (as you might have added) that the *Church of Rome* by cutting off all other Churches from being parts of the *Church Catholick*; ſhe makes her ſelf to be the whole *Catholick Church*, which is *purus putus Donatiſmus* contradicting an *Article* of the *Apoſtles Creed* in expreſs terms, and conſequently by arrogating and ingroſſing to her ſelf the title of *Catholick* in that ſenſe, ſhe is not only a *Schiſmatical*, but an *Heretical* Church alſo as the *Donatiſts* of old were. And *will* you or *can* you continue in the *Communion* of a *Church* which you cannot chuſe but think upon the aforeſaid grounds, to be *Schiſmatical* and *Heretical*.

But *Secondly*, in your aforeſaid *Letter* to Me you ſay, you cannot deny that ſeveral of that Churches *Definitions* ſeem to you to be very falſe and without ſufficient ground either in *Scripture* or *Tradition*: and therefore *firſt*, you cannot deny but that the *Infallibility*, that Church pretends to, which

is

is the foundation of her pretended Authority over all other Churches, muſt needs ſeem to you to be *falſe*; becauſe if ſhe have Erred in *ſome* of her *Definitions*, ſhe may have erred in *any* or in *all* of them. And *Secondly*, if the reaſon why thoſe ſeveral *Definitions* of hers ſeem to you to be *falſe*, is, becauſe they are without ſufficient ground, either in *Scripture* or *Tradition*: I preſume that by *ſeveral*, you mean all thoſe *Definitions* of hers, whereby ſhe hath added ſo many *New Articles* to the *Old Creed*; which cannot chuſe but ſeem to you to be *falſe* for the ſame reaſon; namely, becauſe there is no ſufficient ground for them either in *Scripture* or *Tradition*; if by *Tradition* you do not mean the *Orall Tradition* of the preſent Church of *Rome* (which is a new found extravagant notion of the word *Tradition*) but *Tradition* truly ſo called (viz.) *Quod ſemper, & ubique, & ab omnibus*, which is recorded in the *Fathers*, *Councils*, and *Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtories*, to have been received either as the *Doctrine* or *Practice* of the *Catholick Church*. Howſoever, whether by the *ſeveral Definitions* of that Church, which ſeem to you to be *falſe*, you mean more or fewer, you cannot believe *all* her *Definitions* to be true; which notwithſtanding you are obliged by the aforeſaid *Oath* to profeſs you believe, and that you will teach others to believe ſo alſo. But you have told us already, *That you cannot aſſent to any Doctrine that ſeems to be* Erroneous; and therefore you cannot be of that Church that obliges you to do ſo.

There is a very great difference between *your* Caſe and *Theirs*, who heretofore lived and dyed in the Communion of the then *Church of Rome*. *Firſt* becauſe perhaps the ſame *Doctrines*, which now ſeem to *you* to be *falſe*, did not then, for want of the Information you have, ſeem ſo to *them*. And ſo that which was but a *Sin of Ignorance*, and perhaps of *invincible Ignorance* in *Them*, will be a *Sin againſt Conviction* (which you call a *Sin againſt the Holy Ghoſt*) in *You* now. *Secondly*, Becauſe the explicit and profeſſed Belief of all the Controverted *Doctrines* between Us and them, which the preſent *Church of Rome* exacts as a condition of *Communion* with her now, was not exacted upon the ſame account by the *Church of Rome* then, as appears by what I have ſaid before upon this head. And *Thirdly*, Becauſe (as I ſaid before too) that Thoſe that thought then, as You do now, had no other *Church* to go to, as you now have; and ſuch a Church as you your ſelf confeſs (in your *Letter* to me) to hold and profeſs all that *Catholick* and *Apoſtolick Faith*, which was delivered to the *Primitive Chriſtians* in the *Apoſtolick*, *Nicene*, and *Athanaſian Creeds*, and in the four firſt *General Concils*, and which beſides in her 39 *Articles* hath the very Chief if not the Only *Fundamentals* of all *Orthodoxie*; whereunto if you add, what before I quoted out of your Letter to *Ferns*, that ſhe is neither *Heretical*, nor *Schiſmatical*, what ſhould hinder you from coming out of *that* Church into *this*, ſeeing it is but the coming out of an infected, into an healthy place

place of the same Kingdom; for you will be still in the same Kingdom of *Christ*, which is the whole *Catholick Church* and not any part of it.

O! but say you in your *Letter* to me, *Whatsoever I think of the lawfulness of, or tye of Conscience upon me to approve of, the Communion of the Church of* England; *yet after all, I cannot be satisfied, nor convinced That I am bound to renounce her Communion* (meaning the Communion of the Church of *Rome:*) No! not though you think her *Schismatical?* by rendiug *Christs Body* (the *Catholick Church*) into more pieces than the Soldiers did his Coat; nay, though you think her *Heretical?* for imposing those *Definitions* of hers (which seem to you to be *false*) not only as *probable Opinions*, but as *Articles of Faith*; and to make the believing and the professing the belief of them a condition of her *Communion*, and a part of that Creed, *extra quam nemo potest esse salvus:* which what is it else but to make her own word and not Gods word, or at least her own word, as well as Gods word, the *Rule of Faith?* and is not this *Heresie?* nay is not this to make all those that will be of her Communion, *Hereticks?* and cannot this convince you, that you are bound to renounce such a *Communion*; or rather to profess and declare you have renounced it? as really you have already in the *interior* of your Soul, if you think and believe, as you say you do.

Remember what you say to the Bishop of *Ferns*, when

when you ſuppoſe him to be convinced by what you have ſaid to him, that the Church of *England* is not *Heretical:* that this *conviction* of his Soul, you hope, he will *openly declare*, as it becometh his *Candour* and *Conſcience*; becauſe as St. *Paul* ſaith (ſay you to him) *with the heart man believeth unto Righteouſneſs, and with the mouth confeſſion is made unto Salvation.* And doth not St. *Paul* ſay this to *You* as well as to the Biſhop of *Ferns*? and are not *You* a man of *Candour* and *Conſcience*, as well as *He* is? I am ſure I believe, and I think I have very good reaſon to believe, by what you both have acted, and by what you both have written, that *You* are a *Man* of much more *candour*, *conſcience*, and *ingenuity*, than *He* is or than you can believe him to be: and therefore I have more reaſon to be confident of *You*, than you have to hope of *Him*; namely, *ut quod in imo corde ſentis* concerning both Churches, *illud etiam ore profiteberis*; by publickly renouncing the Communion of the *one*, and by openly joyning in Communion with the *other.*

And indeed how elſe can you juſtifie the Church of *England* for doing, what you will not do your ſelf? perhaps you will ſay, becauſe the Church of *England* was never of Right ſubordinate to the Church of *Rome*, therefore was not obliged to continue in *Communion* with her longer, than ſhe her ſelf ſaw cauſe: which is not the Caſe of the Church of *Ireland*, whereof you are a member; for ſhe always was and is ſtill ſubject to the Church of *Rome*; therefore neither

neither ſhe nor any of her Children are at liberty to quit the Communion with the Church of *Rome*, as thoſe of the Church of *England* are. But then how can you juſtifie Dr. *Sall*'s coming over from Them to Us (which notwithſtanding you ſeem to do) ſeeing *his* Caſe is the very ſame with *Yours*: No, perhaps may you ſay: for he may not have the ſame ſcruples that I have. For perhaps Dr. *Sall* is not, but I am certain, ſay you in your *Letters* to me, that no pretence of *Hereſie* warrants *Inferiors* to quit the *Communion* of their *Church*, or *Subjection* even to *Eccleſiaſtical Superiors*, untill by a due courſe they be convicted and declared *Hereticks*, or *Schiſmaticks*, or *Out-laws*; and this (ſay you, *as far as you can remember*) hath been the judgement of the Eighth *General Council*, which is all the ground you alledge for this certainty of yours in this particular, which I do not a little wonder at; that a man of your acuteneſs of wit, and ſolidity of judgement, ſhould ground certainty upon uncertainty.

For *Firſt* you ſeem not to be certain whether that be the Judgement of the *Council* or no; for it is but *as far as you can remember.*

Secondly, Suppoſing it to be the Judgement of that Council; are you certain that this or any other *General Council* cannot Err? (You ſeem in your Letter to the Biſhop of *Ferns* to be of another Opinion) or if a General Council cannot Err; are you ſure that the *Eighth* General Council which was none of the beſt, or rather the worſt, or at leaſt the moſt

moſt inconſiderable of all (but one) that went before it, did not Err in that particular ? and conſequently may lead you into Error, if you build your certainty upon that judgement of the *Council* only.

Thirdly, Suppoſing it did not Err in decreeing, as you think it did, yet might it not be decreed as a matter of *Diſcipline* only (which is variable according to circumſtances, *pro hic & nunc*) to prevent *Schiſm*, or groundleſs or unneceſſary withdrawing of *Inferiors* Obedience from their *Superiors* ? and not as matter of *Faith*, which is of perpetual and indiſpenſable Obligation ! certainly that *Council* did not intend by that *Decree*, to enjoyn all *Inferiors* to obey all their *Superiors* in all things whatſoever, and conſequently, to obey *Men* rather than *God*, in caſe their *Superiors* ſhould command what God forbids, or will haue them ſubject unto them in ſuch things, as they cannot be ſubject to them in without Sin.

Fourthly, Suppoſing it to be true, as you ſay, and according to the judgement of that *Council*, that no *pretence* of *Hereſie* or *Schiſm* can warrant *Inferiors* to quit the *Communion* of their *Church*, or *Subjection* to their *Eccleſiaſtical Superiors*; untill by a due courſe they be convicted, and declared to be *Schiſmaticks*, or *Hereticks* : ſuppoſing this to be true (I ſay) if there be but a *pretence* only of the aforeſaid crimes; ſhall it therefore be true, where the aforeſaid crimes of *Hereſie* and *Schiſm* are

are evident, and notorious, and where you muſt either quit the *Communion*, or Communicate in thoſe crimes; the belief, profeſſion, and maintaining of which are neceſſary conditions of that *Communion?* Are you certain that becauſe you were born and bred in ſuch a *Communion*, or have been ſubject to it, that you muſt not quit it, but continue in it (and conſequently be partaker, and guilty of the ſin of it) until by *due courſe* thoſe of that *Communion* are *convinced* and *declared* to be *Schiſmaticks*, or *Hereticks*? when perhaps They are ſuch as will never be *convinced*, or when perhaps there neither is nor can be any ſuch *courſe* taken againſt them to *declare* Them to be ſo? For I ſuppoſe by a *due courſe* you mean an *Appeal* or Recourſe to a truly *Oecumenical Council* for the condemning of them, and *declaring* them to be *Hereticks* or *Schiſmaticks*. But ſuch a *Council* in your Letter to *Ferns* you your ſelf confeſs (as the *Chriſtian World* is now governed by ſeveral *Princes* of ſeveral Religions, Intereſts and Deſigns) is neither to be had nor hoped for; or if ſuch a *Council* were to be had, is it likely that he, who hath declared himſelf to be above all *Councils*, will ſubmit to it? or he who pretends to ſit as *Judge* in it, will ſuffer himſelf to be condemned by it? Unhappy then, nay of all Men moſt unhappy are all thoſe who are inferior members of ſuch a *Church*; who, though their mind be never ſo much enlightned by *Gods Word* to ſee their *Errors*, they are injoyned to *believe*, and their hearts never ſo much enclined by *Gods Grace* to deteſt and forſake the *Superſtitious and Idolatrous Worſhip*, they are injoyned to *practice* and comply with: yet they muſt continue in the *profeſſion* of the *one* and *practice* of the *other*; untill the *Church* it ſelf ſhall be pleaſed to *declare*, that ſhe is *con-*

vinced ſhe doth Err, and is guilty of *Hereſie* and *Schiſm* or both; of which there can be no hope, as long as her greateſt and moſt fundamental and yet moſt dearly beloved *Error* is, that ſhe *cannot Err* at all. And therefore (by your favour) it will not follow (as you ſay it will) that becauſe you are, or have been ſubject to that *Church*; and no ſuperior Authority to hers has yet *declared* her to be *Schiſmatical* or *Heretical*, you may conſcientiouſly remain in her *Communion*, tho' you are perſuaded there are *ſome* (you might have ſaid *many*) grievous *Errors* taught in it; (whereunto you ſhould have added) and enjoyned to be *belived* and *practiſed* by it: and then I am ſure it will not follow, that you may conſcientiouſly remain in it. For no man can conſcientiouſly continue in a *Communion*, which neceſſitates him to *Sin*; which muſt be the caſe of all thoſe that continue in the *Communion* of the preſent *Church of Rome*, being ſo perſwaded as you are: for they muſt *profeſs* the belief of all that they think to be *falſe*, and they muſt do thoſe things they are perſwaded are *unlawful* to be done; that is, both their *profeſſion* and *practiſe* muſt (in many things at leaſt) be againſt the dictates of their own *Conſcience:* and how any man can *conſcientiouſly* do one or the other (though for never ſo little a while) I confeſs I ſee not.

But though I can ſee no way, how you can continue in the Church of *Rome* conſcientiouſly, and without Sinning; yet I do ſee a way, how you may conſcientiouſly, and without Sinning come out of the Church of *Rome*: yea though you were by birth and breeding never ſo much *ſubject* to her; and conſequently, the only ſcruple that you pretend

to

to will ceaſe to be a *Remora* or delay to your converſion and yonr avowing of it: And this is a way of your own propoſing: for in your ſecond Letter to *Ferns*, you tell us of *two* ways, whereby a man may extricate himſelf out of ſuch a Labyrinth as you now ſeem to be in. The one you call *via juris*, and that is by *Appeal* to the higheſt *Eccleſiaſtical* power or Authority here on Earth, which you (notwithſtanding the contrary *Decree* in the late *Lateran* Council) take to be the *Repreſentative body* of the *Catholick Church*, in a truly *Oecumenical Synod*. And this way I think you mean by the *due courſe* you would have taken by thoſe, that are *Inferiors* againſt their *Superiors*; at leaſt againſt ſuch *Superiors*, as can have no other Superior Authority above them, but that only.

But what if there be not, nor cannot be any ſuch *ſupream Judicatory* to appeal to (as you your ſelf think there cannot be for the future) ſhall the Conſciences of *Inferiors* be always enſlaved to the will of their *Superiors* to believe or not to believe, to do or not to do, what their *Superiors* will have them, tho' they never ſo much endanger the loſs of their own Souls by it? No, ſay you; for where there cannot be *via Juris*, there may be *via facti & rationis*; that is, where there cannot be an *Appeal* to the *repreſentative*, there may be an Appeal to the *diffuſive* body of the Church by *Apologies* or *Declarations* of the Motives, or Reaſons, why without peril of our Souls we can ſtay no longer in ſuch or ſuch a *Church*, or in ſuch or ſuch a *Communion*. And this way of *Appeal* (you make it appear by many Inſtances) was made uſe of by many Holy men, in the firſt and beſt Ages; and that not only by appealing from *particular Churches*, as from

the *Church of Rome* it ſelf, but from *Patriarchal*, yea from *Oecumenical Councils* themſelves; (whereunto it cannot be denyed, but that the *Appellants* were *Subjects.*) And yet, you ſay, that thoſe particular Holy men, you name, did appeal even from *Oecumenical Councils* themſelves; and that ſometimes *via facti & rationis* only; that is, by repreſenting their Greivances or cauſes of complaint to the *diffuſive body* of the Church, by their Letters to other *Biſhops*, giving a full account of themſelves, and of the hope that was in them, and appealing to the judgment of all men whatſoever, able to underſtand the merits of their cauſe; and did thereby (ſay you) not only ſatisfie their own *Conſciences* (which is very remarkable as to your preſent Caſe) but undeceive other *Churches* alſo. And by this way) I mean the *via facti & rationis*) that is by appealing in Print to all the *Chriſtian World* (ſay you) hath the *Church of England* juſtified her ſelf for her ſeparation from the *Church of Rome.* And this way may every *private Chriſtian* as well as any *particular Church*, make uſe of, upon the like occaſion; whether he be *Subject* to the Authority he appeals from, or not; as appears by ſome of your own *Inſtances* in the place before quoted. To conclude, this way and no other hath Dr. *Sall* your Countryman and Fellow ſubject to the *Church of Rome* taken, to juſtifie his quitting of it, and is not blamed at all but rather juſtified by you for ſo doing.

Why therefore do not you follow *his* Example, or rather why do not you follow the Examples of thoſe Worthies, and *Heroes* of the *Primitive Church*, whom you often ſo commend for having made uſe of this way, that Dr. *Sall* hath made uſe of? And that not only by appealing from *particular Churches* to the

the *Catholick Church repreſentative*, but even from the *Catholick repreſentative* (whereunto They and all others were more *ſubject*, than They or any others could be to any *particular Church* whatſoever) to the *Catholick Church diffuſive*? You have done ſo your ſelf already in one Point of ſo very great moment and conſequence to that Church, and to that Intereſt of hers, wherein ſhe is ſo much concerned that ſhe would ſooner have forgiven you, if you had declared your ſelf an *Arrian*, or *Socinian*, or denyed *Tranſubſtantiation* it ſelf or any ſpeculative *Tenet* of hers whatſoever; as you may perceive by the *Excommunication*, the *General* of your *Order* hath thundred out againſt you for it. One would think therefore it ſhould be no hard matter to perſuade you to come out of a *Church*, that hath thruſt you out already.

But you will ſay, you hold the *Excommunication* to be null, as being *Clave errante*; and that you are ſtill as much of that *Church*, as you were before you were Excommunicated. I believe it; for being perſwaded, as you were, when you writ that, for which you were Excommunicated, you did then ceaſe to be a member of that *Church*: but for all that you may ſtill be, you will ſay, a member of the *Church Catholick*. You may indeed be ſo; and ſo you may be by joining in *Communion* with the *Church of England*, though you quit, or are thruſt out of the *Church of Rome*. But whether you can be truly in *Communion* with the *Church Catholick*, whilſt you remain in *Communion* with ſuch a *particular Church*, as enjoyns you to *believe* ſuch things, as you think to be *falſe*; and to *do* ſuch things as you think to be *ſinful*; or whether you can be truly in *Communion* with the *Church Catholick*, when you are not in *Communion* with any *particular Church* at all; eſpecially, when there is a *particular*

Church;

Church, you your ſelf confeſs you may ſafely join with, and whoſe Arms are open to receive you; You were beſt to conſider.

And truly if what I have ſaid, and I hope proved, by what I have produced out of your own Papers, be enough, as I hope it is, to convince you of the truth of my *firſt Aſſertion* (viz.) *That being perſuaded as you are, you cannot with a good conſcience continue in the Communion of the preſent Church of* Rome; I hope there is need of little nor indeed of any thing more to be ſaid, to convince you of the truth of my *Second Aſſertion* alſo (viz.) *That having quitted the Communion of the Church of* Rome, *becauſe you are perſuaded as you are, you are for the very ſelf ſame reaſon obliged both in conſcience, and in prudence alſo to joyn in Communion with the Church of* England.

And firſt you are obliged in *Conſcience* to joyn in *Communion* with the Church of *England*, rather than with any other of the *Proteſtant* or *Reformed Churches*: becauſe, tho' I will not deny but thoſe that are born and bred in any of thoſe other *Churches* may conſcientiouſly continue in Communion with them; yet for one that is at liberty to joyn in Communion with which he will of them; ſuch a one no doubt is bound in conſcience to joyn in *Communion* with that *Church* rather than any of the reſt, which is, and which he thinks to be, the beſt *Reformed* of them. Now that the Church of *England* is the beſt *Reformed Church*, no indifferent or impartial Judge can deny, that conſiders either the Manner of its being Reformed, or its Reformation it ſelf.

And *firſt* for its *Manner of being Reformed*, it was, as the Temple of *Hieruſalem* was built, without the noiſe of Axes and Hammers; it was not by *Popular Tumults* or *Rebellons* againſt

againſt the *Civil Magiſtrate*, as all, or moſt of other *Proteſtant Churches* were Reformed; but by the *Royal Authority*, aſſiſted with the Advice and Conſent of the Repreſentative Body of the *Clergy* in *Convocation*, and of the Repreſentative Body of the reſt of the *People* in *Parliament*.

And *2dly*. for the *Reformation it ſelf*; it was not by taking any thing away that was *neceſſary* or *profitable*, either as to *Doctrine* or *Worſhip*, but by cutting off that which was *falſe* and *ſuperfluous* in the *one*, or by purging out that which was *noxious* and *ſuperſtitious* (I might ſay *idolatrous* alſo) in the *other*; ſtill preſerving the *Apoſtolical Diſcipline*, as well as the *Apoſtolical Doctrine*; I mean the *Epiſcopal Government* of the Church, which all *Calviniſt* Churches want, and much the major part of the *Lutheran* Churches alſo: and thoſe that have it, have it but *nomine tenus* only. So that in regard both of *Doctrine* and of *Diſcipline*, and of *Government* too, the Church of *England* ſeems to be the only *Apoſtolical Church* now extant in the World; and therefore the *Communion* with it, is in *conſcience* to be made choice of before any other by him that is at liberty to chuſe for himſelf, as I ſuppoſe you to be; but to one ſo well perſuaded of the Church of *England*, as you (by what I have quoted out of your own Papers) ſeem to be, none of this need to have been ſaid, to prove, that upon quitting the Church of *Rome*, you are obliged to come over to the Church of *England*, rather than to any other *Proteſtant Reformed Church* in point of *Conſcience*.

As likewiſe in point of *Prudence* alſo; *I* mean in order to the *Protection* of your *Perſon*, which can hardly be ſafe any where beyond Sea; and in order to a *Proviſion* for your future *Subſiſtence* alſo; which I will undertake ſhall not be wanting to you.

It

It remains therefore, that being obliged to quit the *Communion* of the Church of *Rome*, and to joyn in *Communion* with the Church of *England*, you are obliged alſo not to defer the quitting of the *one*, and joyning with the *other*, but *ſpeedily and publickly to declare you do ſo*; which was my *third* and laſt *Aſcertion*, which I think will need no farther proof than what I have ſaid already. For if you cannot continue in the *Communion* with the Church of *Rome*, without continuing ſinning againſt your Conſcience, in you muſt needs be obliged to quit it, and quit it preſently. And if you are to be of ſome *particular Church* or other, to make you a Member of the *Church Catholick*, and according to your perſwaſion you cannot ſo conſcientiouſly joyn with any other as with the Church of *England*, then certainly you are to quit the *one* and joyn with the *other*, without any farther delay or procraſtination; yea, and to *declare* you do ſo by the *via facti & Rationis* (as you call it) that is, by giving an account to the whole *Chriſtian World*, by ſome publick *Declaration*, of the Motives or Reaſons perſwading you to do ſo, as Dr. *Sall* hath done, and as, you ſay, many of the *Primitive Fathers* and *Saints* did upon the like occaſion.

Remember what you ſay to the Bp. *Ferns* concerning Dr. *Sall*'s quitting the *Roman* for the *Engliſh Communion*: namely, that they were the tortures of thoſe *Ictus* and *Laniatus* of his Conſcience that made him do it, as he himſelf (you ſay) told you, and which (as you ſay likewiſe in the ſame place) muſt at long running be the unhappy conqueſt of all that continue *Rebels againſt the Light*: But eſpecially remember what you ſay in that very next Page of the ſame Letter (*viz.*) If our unfortunate checking here the *Light* of our *Conſcience* within us, ſhould deprive us of ſeeing the *Light of Lights*, and ſupereſſential Fountain of all Lights, what ſhall become of us?

Laſtly, That no fear of Worldly Reproach may hinder or retard the *Declaration* we expect from you, remember what you ſay in another place of your *Letter* to the ſame *Biſhop*, That when you change, or declare you change your Judgement upon conviction of *Conſcience*, ſuch a *Change* (ſay you to *him*, and ſo ſay I to *you*) cannot be any diſparagement; becauſe, *Non eſt reputanda prævaricatio, ſed temeritatis emendatio*; according to the *Papal Canons* as you quote it. And you add in the ſame place, that S. *Auſtin* no were appear'd more Glorious than in his *Retractations*. And thus leaving you to make your own *Reflections* upon theſe and the others which I before quoted of *your own* Sayings, and beſeeching God to give you *Courage* and *Reſolution* to do, what in *Conſcience* you ſhall be convinced you ought to do; I Reſt

Your very Affectionate Friend and Servant in Chriſt Jeſus.

GEOR. WINTON.

From *Farnam Caſtle*, *November* 9. 1676.

THE SUMME OF A Short Conference BETWIXT Father Darcy AND Doctour Morley, AT BRUXELLS,

June 23. 1649. *Stylo Novo.*

UNIVERSITY OF CAMBRIDGE LIBRARY

LONDON,
Printed for *Joanna Brome.* 1683.

THE

SUMME

OF A

Short Conference

BETWIXT

Dame Mary

AND

Doctor Hooker,

AT

BRUXELLS.

LONDON.

The Summe of a Short Conference betwixt Father Darcy *and Doctor* Morley, *at* Bruxells, *June the 23d* 1649. Stylo Novo.

CAMBRIDGE

THE Lord Viſcount *Neuburgh*, Mr. *William Murray* the younger, Dr. *Creighton* and Dr. *Morley*, deſiring among other things worthy the ſeeing at *Bruxells* to viſit the *Jeſuits College*; they went thither the day above-written towards the evening, and enquir'd for Father *Darcy*, an *Engliſh Jeſuite*, whom they found with the Lord *Andover* in his company. He received them very courteouſly, and deſir'd them to withdraw with him into a little Gallery, where, having made them all ſit down, and believing the end of their coming to be nothing elſe (as indeed it was not) but to ſatisfie their Curioſities, in ſeeing the Buildings, and acquainting themſelves with the Faſhions and Cuſtoms of the *Society*; he did firſt very frankly make us a very large *Narrative* of the manner of their Living, Lodging, Diet, together with the hours of Riſing, Studying, Eating and Recreations, and of all the Spiritual hours and Exerciſes they were bound unto; Things, all of them in their ſeveral kinds, for the ſubſtance of them, very commendable and worthy the imitation.

After this Narrative the Lord *Andover* began to wiſh that ſome few learned and moderate men of the *Church of Rome* and *England*, might meet and debate freely and charitably, the *Differences* between the two *Churches*, which I believe, (ſaid he) are not ſo many or ſo great, but that men ſo qualified and affected, might find out ſome *me-*

dium or Expedient to compoſe them: and was pleaſed to add, that there were two ſuch men of the *Church of England* there, and if there were but ſuch another of the *Church of Rome* as Father *Darcy* was, he believed ſome good might be done to that purpoſe. Dr *Creighton* and Dr. *Morley* replyed that his Lordſhip had made but an ill choice for the *Church of England* in point of ſufficiency for ſo weighty a buſineſs: and Dr. *Morley* did add particularly, that it might be a very imprudent and unſafe thing for him or Dr. *Creighton* to enter into a diſpute of *Religion* in that place; though he had known and been at diverſe diſputes of that nature in *England*, where the Prieſts of the *Romiſh* Party, and profeſſing themſelves to be ſo, had with all boldneſs, freedom and ſafety, and before many witneſſes, maintained the opinions of their party. *And ſo, upon my life, may you doe here*, replied Father *Darcy* (and ſaying this he gave Dr. *Morley* his hand upon it) *and be ſo far from hazarding your ſelf, or offending me, that I ſhall rather take it as a favour from you.*

Whereupon Dr. *Morley* conſidering what a prejudice it might be to the *Church of England*, if the *Jeſuite* ſhould report that two *Doctors* of that Church, being ſo fairly invited, refuſed to enter into a fair and friendly *Conference*; and withall fearing what ill effects ſo open a tergiverſation might produce in the minds of the By-ſtanders, which were all of them young men, and one of them then thought to be wavering in point of Religion: upon theſe conſiderations (I ſay) Dr. *Morley* thought fit to ſay, that he could wiſh there might be ſuch a Debate betwixt ſuch Perſons of either ſide as the Lord *Andover* ſpoke of; but withall, that he found there could be but little fruit of a *Conference*, when one of the Parties were reſolved before hand to hold their

Conclu-

Concluſion, and to remit nothing of what they had formerly held for any conſideration whatſoever.

The *Father* replyed, that perhaps we ſhould not find them ſo ſtiff in all Points; for in things of *poſitive* and *Eccleſiaſtical Conſtitution* onely, the *Church* might in order to *Chriſtian Peace*, alter ſomething which ſhe had before eſtabliſh'd; and he doubted not but ſhe would; and his inſtances were the *Latin Service*, the *Sacrament* under one *Species*, and the *Cælibate of Prieſts*: but as for matters of *Faith*, they could not alter or abate any thing; and for matter of Faith, he inſtanced in that point of the *Churches Infallibility*, eſpecially, as the moſt important of all others.

Dr. *Morley* replyed, that if by the word *Church*, were meant *all Chriſtians*, in all places, he would willingly grant, that the *Church* in that ſenſe, did never, nor could never err in any point of *Faith* or *Manners*, abſolutely neceſſary to ſalvation; becauſe in that caſe the myſtical Head muſt be without a Body: but withall, that he did not take thoſe in Communion with the *Pope* to be the *Church* in that ſenſe, but onely a part, and a corrupted part of it; and conſequently ſuch a Church as not onely *might err* (which is the caſe of all particular Churches whatſoever) but ſuch a Church as *had erred* and *did err*.

Whereunto the *Jeſuite* replyed, that the *Church of Rome* neither had erred, nor could err: Hereupon Dr. *Morley* framed this *Argument*.

That Church which formerly held that for matter of Faith, and neceſſary to Salvation, which now it doth not hold to be ſo, but rather to be an Errour; that Church either hath erred, or doth err, and conſequently may err, and is not infallible: But this was the Caſe of the Church of Rome----Ergo, *&c.*

The

The *Jeſuite* denying the *Minor*, or *Second Propoſition* of this *Syllogiſm*; the *Dr.* inſtanced in the *Communion of Infants*, which the *Church of Rome* once held *de fide*, to be neceſſary for their Salvation, but now doth not; and for proof it did hold ſo formerly, he quoted the teſtimonies of Pope St. *Innocent* I. and St. *Auſtin*, who did both of them ſpeak of the communicating of Infants, not onely as of a thing generally practis'd, but generally held as a Doctrine *de fide*, and abſolutely neceſſary for the Salvation of Infants by the Church of their times. He quotedli kewiſe *Binnius*, and *Maldonate* the Jeſuite, who both affirm, that this was not onely the Opinion of St. *Innocent* and St. *Auſtin*, but the Doctrine of the whole *Church*, for many hundreds of years: particularly *Maldonate* upon thoſe words of St. *John* in his 6th Chapter, *Niſi manducaveritis carnem & biberitis ſanguinem*, &c. hath theſe words, (ſpeaking of the neceſſity of communicating of Infants) *Hæc non fuit tantùm opinio Sancti* Innocentii, *& Beati* Auguſtini, *ſed dogma de fide univerſalis Eccleſiæ per ſexcentos annos.*

Hereunto the ſumme of the *Jeſuite*'s anſwer was, that either the aforeſaid Authours were miſquoted, or miſunderſtood by the Doctor; or poſſibly, (ſaid he) they may call a *Conformity* to the *practice* of the *Church* for the preſent, a *Doctrine of Faith*, and neceſſary to ſalvation; not becauſe it was ſo in it ſelf, but as a part of *Obedience*, it being a *matter of Faith* to obey the *Church* in all things.

Whereunto the *Doctor*'s reply was, that though it ſhould be granted to be a *matter of Faith* to obey the *Church* in all things, yet it would not follow, that all things taught or commanded or practis'd by the Church were matters of Faith or neceſſary to Salvation; and ſuch was the aforeſaid inſtance taken to be by *Innocent*, *Auguſtin*, and the Church of

of their time; and acknowledged to be taken in that ſenſe, not onely by the aforeſaid *Fathers*, but by the whole *Church*, according to the Judgment of *Binnius* and *Maldonate*: adding that whether he had miſquoted or miſunderſtood the aforeſaid Authours, would eaſily appear upon peruſal of their Books, which he doubted not were all in their Library: but the *Father* ſeemed not willing to put it upon that Tryal.

Afterwards (I ſaw not upon what occaſion) the *Jeſuite* ſaid, that doubtleſs it was a more *prudent* and *ſafe* way to venture a mans ſelf in that *Church*, wherein by the *Adverſaries* confeſſion men may be ſaved, than in ſuch a Church, wherein according to the judgment of all *Catholicks*, no man could be ſaved.

To this the *Doctor* replyed (*firſt*) that this was rather the uſual ſaying than the ſettled judgment of all *Catholicks*; for Father *Knott* himſelf, in Chap. 2. of that Book which he writes on purpoſe to vindicate that common ſaying of the *Papiſts* from uncharitableneſs, doth yet in Chap. 2. of that very Book grant, that the Caſe may be ſuch, as that a *Proteſtant* dying a *Proteſtant* may be ſaved; which is all that is granted by *Proteſtants* in favour of *Papiſts* dying *Papiſts*: (*Secondly*,) ſuppoſing the *Church of England* did hold a poſſibility of Salvation in the *Church of Rome*, and the *Church of Rome* did deny a poſſibility of Salvation in the *Church of England*; it would no more follow, that therefore it were *ſafe* or *prudent* for a man to leave our Church, to go to theirs, than it would follow, that it were moſt ſafe or prudent for a man to go out of an healthy or an uninfected place into a *Peſt-houſe*, upon the bare affirmation of thoſe in the *Peſt-houſe*, that a man could be ſafe no where elſe, together with a conceſſion of thoſe that are not in the *Peſt-houſe*, that there was

was a poſſibility that ſome that were in the *Peſt-houſe* might perhaps, though with much difficulty and danger, eſcape the being mortally infected even there alſo.

Adding moreover, that by this way of arguing, it would follow, that it were better and ſafer for a man to be of the *Donatiſts* perſwaſion, than of St. *Auſtin*'s; becauſe St. *Auſtin* granted that a *Donatiſt* might be ſaved, whereas the *Donatiſts* did then (as the *Papiſts* do now) affirm that whoſoever was not a *Donatiſt*, and conſequently St. *Auſtin* himſelf, could not be ſaved.

To the *former* part of this Anſwer of the *Doctor*'s the *Jeſuite*'s reply, was that he could not believe Father *Knott* ſaid any ſuch thing; and to the *latter*, that he did as little believe that St. *Auſtin* was ſo favourable as the Doctor reported him to be unto the *Donatiſts*.

For proof of both the *Doctor* did again appeal to a tryal by the *Books* themſelves, but the *Jeſuite* was not forward to give him or the By-ſtanders that ſatisfaction: and it now beginning to grow dark, they parted with terms of great civility and reſpect, neither of them ſeeming to have taken any offence at all to one another.

I do affirm this to be the true Narrative *of what paſt betwixt Dr.* Morley *and the* Jeſuite *at the aforeſaid Meeting, and particularly that Dr.* Morley *was ſo far from provoking the* Jeſuite, *that he would not enter into any Diſpute, till he was invited and preſſed to it, and untill the* Jeſuite *told him he would take it for a favour from him. I affirm moreover that the* Conference *began and ended with all Civility on both parts; and that the Lord* Andover *ſaid to me afterwards, that the* Jeſuite *told him he could take no Exceptions at all to Dr.* Morley's *Carriage of himſelf in it.* Ita teſtor *NEUBURGH.*

AN ARGUMENT

Drawn from the

EVIDENCE and *CERTAINTY*

OF

SENSE,

Againſt the

DOCTRINE OF Tranſubſtantiation.

UNIVERSITY LIBRARY CAMBRIDGE

By Dr. *Morley*, whilſt he was beyond-ſea.

LONDON,
Printed for *Joanna Brome*. 1683.

AN

ARGUMENT

DRAWN FROM

SENSE

IN FAVOUR OF THE

DOCTRINE

OF

Transubstantiation.

By Dr. Morley, Bish. of Winchester &c.

LONDON:

Printed for Joanna Brome. 1688.

An Argument drawn from the evidence and certainty of Senſe, *againſt the Doctrine of* Tranſubſtantiation, *or the* Church of Romes *interpretation of theſe words* [hoc eſt Corpus meum] *this is my Body, affirming* That in the Sacrament of the Altar the whole ſubſtance of the Bread is turned into the ſubſtance of Chriſt's Body; and the whole ſubſtance of the Wine into the ſubſtance of Chriſt's Bloud: *ſo that after* Conſecration *there remains neither the* ſubſtance *of* Bread, *nor the* ſubſtance *of* Wine, *but onely the* Body *and* Bloud *of Chriſt, under the* ſpecies, *or* accidents *of* Bread *and* Wine. *Conc. Trid. Seſſ. 13. Cap. 4.*

UNIVERSITY ARTIST COLLEGE 1503 CAMBRIDGE

Againſt which *Poſition* of theirs I argue thus.

THAT which fruſtrates or makes void the end and uſe of all Scripture cannot be the true interpretation of any one place of Scripture.

But the Church of Romes interpretation of this one place of Scripture (Hoc eſt Corpus meum) *fruſtrates, or makes void the end and uſe of all Scripture.*

Therefore the Church of Romes interpretation of of this place of Scripture cannot be true.

The *Major*, or *firſt propoſition* of this *Syllogiſm* I ſuppoſe to be ſo evident, that none of the Church of *Rome* will deny it.

The *Minor* or *ſecond Propoſition* I prove thus.

That which neceſſarily implies our Senſes are, or may be deceived in their proper objects: (ſo that what ſeems to all mens Senſes to be one thing, may be, and indeed is another thing) *muſt needs fruſtrate or make void the end and uſe of all Scripture.*

But the Church of Romes interpretation of theſe Words (hoc eſt Corpus meum) *doth neceſſarily imply that our Senſes may be, and are deceived in their proper objects*; by teaching and affirming that to be Fleſh and Bloud, which to all mens Senſes appears to be Bread and Wine.

Therefore the Church of Romes interpretation of theſe words (hoc eſt Corpus meum) *doth fruſtrate and make void the uſe and end of all Scripture.*

The *Major* likewiſe of this *Syllogiſm* (though it be evident enough) yet may it be farther illuſtrated and confirmed. Becauſe *all Scripture* being *written* (as St. *Paul* ſaies it is) *for our Learning*, and there being no other *medium* or means whereby we can come to know what is written in the Scripture for our Learning, but our *Senſes* either by *reading* it our ſelves or *hearing* it from others;

Rom. 15. 8.

if

if I be not certain of what I ſee when I *reade* my ſelf, nor of what I *hear* when I am read to, or preached to, by others, it is impoſſible for me to know what the Scripture teacheth; and conſequently the Scripture it ſelf muſt needs be uſeleſs or to no purpoſe. And not the *Scripture* onely, but the *Church* it ſelf alſo; becauſe the *Church*, as well as the *Scripture*, teacheth us by no other *medium*, but that of our *Senſes*: So that if I be not certain that what I ſee and feel, taſte and ſmell to be *Bread* and *Wine*, is *Bread* and *Wine*, but ſomething elſe; by the ſame reaſon, I cannot be certain that theſe words (*hoc eſt Corpus meum*) whether I *ſee* them written, or hear them ſpoken, be indeed thoſe Words, and not ſome other Words, of a different and perhaps of a quite contrary ſignification: and conſequently they that deny what we ſee and taſte in the *Sacrament* to be the ſame what our ſight and taſte tells us it is, muſt confeſs that they cannot tell what it is themſelves; they having no other kind of *medium* to inform them but what they have already ſaid may be and is deceived. To conclude, if I may believe my Senſes in an object of Senſe, it is *Bread* and *Wine* after Conſecration as well as before. And, if I muſt not believe my Senſes in an object of Senſe, it is abſolutely impoſſible for me to know what it is either after or before Conſecration; becauſe it is my *Senſe*, and nothing but my Senſe, whereby both the *Scripture* and the *Church* inform (This is my Body.)

form my underſtanding. If it be replyed, that the *Sacrament* is an object of *Faith* and not of *Senſe*, and therefore not to be judged of by our ſenſes, or according to our ſenſes. I anſwer that although the *inward and inviſible Grace*, in the Sacrament, or the thing ſignified, be an object of *Faith*; yet the *outward and viſible Sign*, is an object of *Senſe*; and it is that which we affirm to be what it appears to be unto our ſenſes. Nay, the inward and inviſible Grace it ſelf could not be the object of our *Faith*, unleſs it had been firſt the object of our *Senſe*; I mean unleſs our Eye by *reading* in the *Scripture*, or our Ear by *hearing* from the *Church*, had informed us it is ſo: For *Faith* it ſelf (ſaith St. *Paul*)
Rom. 10. 17. *comes by hearing:* his meaning is, That all we are to believe of God, or in order to God, we muſt hear it from God, ſpeaking to us (not as he did to ſome formerly by Dreams and Viſions or Inſpirations, but) either in his *Word* or by his *Church*; and conſequently, if we cannot be certain of what we *read or hear*, we cannot be certain of what we *believe*, nor of what we ought to believe neither; for as the ſame Apoſtle ſaith,
1 Cor. 14. 8. (upon another occaſion) *if the trumpet give an uncertain ſound, how ſhall a man prepare himſelf for Battel?* ſo may I ſay upon this occaſion, if *Faith* come by *hearing*, and *hearing* be uncertain, how can *Faith* it ſelf be certain? But if there be a certainty and undeceivableneſs in our Senſe of

Hearing

Hearing, there muſt needs be a great (if not a greater) certainty or undeceivableneſs in our Senſe of *Seeing*; eſpecially having the atteſtation of ſo many other of our Senſes, as it hath, in the matter of the *Sacrament*. Beſides it importeth us more that there ſhould be a certainty of *Senſe* in conveying to us matters of *Faith*, than of conveying to us the knowledge of any thing elſe whatſoever: not onely becauſe *matters of Faith* are of a great deal more importance in themſelves, and conſequently Errours in matters of Faith a great deal more dangerous than in any other Science or knowledge whatſoever; but alſo becauſe *matters of Faith* are not to be believed or aſſented to (as other things are) becauſe they are, or can be proved and demonſtrated by our own Reaſon, or by ſuch arguments as perhaps have no dependance at all upon our Senſe; but becauſe God (who can neither deceive nor be deceived) hath revealed them in his *Word*, and out of his Word to us by our *Senſes*: So that if we cannot be ſure of the certainty of our *Senſes*, we cannot be ſure of any thing God hath revealed in his *Word*, nor conſequently of this or any other matter of Faith whatſoever. Becauſe ſuppoſing an uncertainty of *Senſe*, when things are to be believed for no other reaſon but becauſe they are *written* or *preached*, and conſequently becauſe we either *read* or *hear* them, then whatſoever elſe can be pretended for any aſſurance in things

things of that nature, muſt needs be uſeleſs and to no purpoſe. And therefore (as St. *Auguſtin* ſaid) *Quod non lego, non credo,* what I read not, I believe not; ſo may I ſay, if I know not what I *read,* I know not what I *believe* neither: And I am ſure I cannot know what I *read* if I am not ſure my ſight doth not, nor cannot deceive me in what I *ſee.* I ſtill ſuppoſe the *Organ* of Senſe, or the Eye rightly diſpoſed, and the *Object* within a convenient diſtance, and the *Medium* ſuch as it ought to be: none of which can be ſuppoſed to be wanting where the object appears to be always the *ſame* to all mens Senſes, as it doth in the preſent queſtion.

Neither will it ſerve the turn to ſay, that although ordinarily, and uſually, and generally the *Senſe* be not deceived in its proper *Object,* yet ſometimes, and in ſome things it may be deceived, and particularly in this of the *Sacrament:* For if there were not a certainty of *Senſe* in every thing (I mean in every thing that is an *Object* of Senſe) there would not be a certainty of *Senſe* in any thing; becauſe by the ſame reaſon that my Senſe may deceive me in one thing, it may doe ſo in another thing; and conſequently in all things. Nay, if I were ſure it could deceive me but in one thing onely, yet if I did not know what that one thing was, I could never be ſure I was not always deceived; becauſe I could never be ſure that this thing was not that one thing; unleſs *Chriſt* ſhould have ſaid in clear and expreſs

expreſs Words, ---- *Believe your Senſes in all things elſe but onely in the matter of the Sacrament.* As the *Papiſts* ſay that * *Extenſio eſt Ratio formalis quantitatis*, but onely in the quantity of the body of Chriſt, as it is in the *Sacrament*; as if any thing could be any where without its *formalis ratio*, that is, without that which makes it to be what it is, and without which it is impoſſible for it to be at all. But *Chriſt* hath never ſaid any ſuch thing, nor made any ſuch particular Exception in favour of *Tranſubſtantiation*; and no leſs authority than *Chriſt*'s is enough to make any man (that hath not firſt ſwallowed the Opinion of their Churches *Infallibility*) to believe it.

* *Extenſion of Parts is the formal cauſe or that which makes quantity to be quantity.*

'Tis to as little purpoſe to tell us, that this *Converſion* of *Bread* and *Wine* into the *Body* and *Blood* of Chriſt is *miraculous:* as ſuppoſing ſuch a *Converſion* (which by the way is but the begging of the Queſtion) becauſe it is *miraculous*, therefore it muſt needs be ſo monſtrous, as to be a contradiction unto *Senſe:* whereas *Miracles*, in the nature and uſe of them, are not Contradictions of Senſe but Appellations to Senſe; and the End of them is by the Evidence of our *Senſe*, to convince our *Underſtanding* of ſome thing which otherwiſe we would not, or could not have believed. And therefore in all *miraculous Converſions* (we reade of in Scripture) of one thing into another, there was an *Ocular* or viſible *de-*

monſtration, that there was ſuch a Converſion: and that not onely in regard of the *Subſtance*, but of the *Accidents* alſo, and that as well in regard of the thing changed, as of that whereunto it was changed. For when *Moſes his Rod* was turned into a *Serpent*, it ceaſed not onely to *be* a Rod, but to *look* like a Rod, and as it became a *Serpent* indeed, ſo it had the *colour*, the *ſhape*, and *quality* of a Serpent: which the *Magicians* rods, which were not turned into Serpents, had not. In like manner, when our *Saviour* did miraculouſly turn *Water* into *Wine*, it did no longer look like Water, or if it did look like Water (as ſome Wine doth) yet did it neither ſmell like Water, nor taſte like Water; but as it had the *Subſtance*, ſo it had the *Accidents*, or qualities, of Wine alſo. Neither indeed can there be a Change of one thing into another, without a mutual change of the *Accidents*, as well as of the *Subſtance*. Becauſe every thing conſiſts of and is made up of *Accidents* as well as *Subſtance*: Neither can *Subſtance* (I mean a corporeal ſubſtance) exiſt without *Accidents*, any more than Accidents can ſubſiſt without Subſtance; at leaſt, if there could be a Subſtance without its own Accidents, or Accidents without their own Subſtance; yet no man could be obliged to believe there was one without the other; becauſe it is not poſſible to judge of one, but by the other. I mean, no man can diſcern any one Sub-

Subſtance from another (at leaſt here in this Life) but by its proper Accidents.

And therefore, if granting the *Major* of my *Syllogiſm* to be true (*viz.*) that *Whatſoever neceſſarily implies our Senſes are or may be deceived in their proper Objects, muſt needs fruſtrate and make void the end and uſe of all Scripture.* If granting this to be true (I ſay) they ſhall deny the *Minor*, and affirm that the *Church of Romes* interpretation of theſe words, (*hoc eſt corpus meum*) doth not neceſſarily imply, that our *Senſes* are, or may be deceived in their proper *Objects*; becauſe the proper Objects of our Senſes (ſay they) are not the *Subſtances* but *Accidents* of things: I anſwer, that though indeed the * *Objectum formale*, or the *Objectum quo*, (as they call it) of the Senſe are *Accidents*; yet *Subſtances*, I mean Corporeal Subſtances are the † *Objectum materiale*, or the *Objectum quod* (as they call it) even of our outward ſenſes. My meaning is, that though the *Senſe* do diſcern immediately of *Accidents* onely; yet mediately, or * *mediantibus accidentibus*, it diſcerns of *Subſtances* alſo: So that indeed, it is neither the *Accidents* alone nor the *Subſtance* alone, but the *Thing* it ſelf, conſiſting both of Accidents and Subſtance; or as it is diſtinguiſhable by ſuch, and ſuch accidents, from any other thing, that hath not ſuch accidents; that is the adequate and complete *Object of Senſe.* Otherwiſe how could a man ſay, he ſaw ſuch a

* *The object by which we perceive.*

† *The object which we do perceive.*

* *By the means or mediation of Accidents.*

man, or heard ſuch a ſtory, or ſmelt ſuch a ſmell, or taſted ſuch a liquor, or touched ſuch a thing, if *Accidents* alone, without *Subſtance*, were the object of his Senſes? or if every *Subſtance* were not ſenſibly diſcernable, and diſtinguiſhable, by its own proper *Accidents*? And indeed, to what purpoſe have our *Senſes* been given us, by our good God, if We could not by our Senſes, diſcern, and diſtinguiſh the *Things* themſelves, as well as their *Accidents*?

For which end, and Purpoſe, God hath given us ſo many ſeveral *Senſes*, to diſcern and diſtinguiſh ſeveral *Things* by their ſeveral *accidents*; becauſe ſeveral Things may have ſome the ſame Accidents; and conſequently, being not diſtinguiſhable one from another by thoſe Senſes, of which thoſe Accidents, wherein thoſe Things agree, are formally the proper objects; for example, *Chalk* and *Cheeſe*, *white Wine* and *Water*, may have the ſame *colour*, *figure* and *quantity*, and conſequently, are not diſtinguiſhable by the *Sight* onely; but then having not the ſame, but a different *ſcent* and *ſavour*, they are eaſily diſtinguiſhable by the *Smell* and by the *Taſte*.

Iſaac could not know his Sons *Jacob* and *Eſau* from one another by his ſenſe of *feeling*, becauſe *Jacob*'s hands, which his Father felt, were rough like *Eſau*'s; but he might have diſtinguiſhed them by his ſenſe of *hearing*, becauſe the voice of *Jacob* was not like the voice of *Eſau*. And

ſo

ſo likewiſe, when *Chriſt* firſt appeared to his *Apoſtles* after his Reſurrection, *They took him* (ſaith the Text) *for a Spirit*; becauſe a *Spirit* may have the ſhape, the appearance, and ſuperficial reſemblance of a *Man*, and conſequently is not diſtinguiſhable from a *Man* by the *ſight* onely; but a *ſpirit* (ſaith *Chriſt*) *hath not fleſh and bones*; and conſequently, as ſoon as they touched him, they found by their ſenſe of *feeling*, that he was not a *Spirit*, but a *Man*. And ſo all thoſe *Spirits* or apparitions We reade of in Scripture, might have been diſcerned to be *no Men* even by *Senſe* onely, as well as *Chriſt* was diſcerned by *Senſe*, to be *no Spirit:* and he that denies this to be true, muſt needs affirm that the Κριτήριον, or Means of diſcerning betwixt a *Man*, and a *Spirit* or apparition (which *Chriſt* himſelf gave unto his Apoſtles) was falſe, or inſufficient. Now if a *Body* may by *Senſe* be known and diſtinguiſhed from a *Spirit*, in a bodily ſhape, or figure; much more may any one Body, (whether it be a *Perſon* or *Thing*) be diſtinguiſhed from another Body; though not always by any one Senſe *ſingly*; yet always by one, or more of the Senſes *joyntly:* the one correcting the Error, or rather ſupplying the Defect of the other. For indeed, no one of the Senſes *ſingly*, can err or be deceived in judging of its own proper Object; I mean its *formal object*, nor of the *material object* neither, ſo far

as it is diſcernable by ſuch a formal object, or by ſuch *accidents*, as are properly and formally the object of ſuch a ſingle ſenſe; as Sight (★ *Poſitis omnibus ad viſionem requiſitis*, (viz.) *oculo benè diſpoſito, medio congruo, & diſtantiâ objecti convenienti*; it) cannot err or be deceived, in judging of *Colours* nor *Coloratum*, or the thing coloured, as far as it is to be judged of by Colour: but every *Coloratum* is not diſcernable by Colour onely, becauſe ſeveral things may be of the ſame Colour, and therefore, the *Sight* onely, is not ſufficient of it ſelf or ſingly, to judge of every thing that is *Coloratum* or coloured. But all the Senſes *joyntly*, or together, and helping one another, cannot be deceived in judging either of their *formal*, or *material objects*, that is either of the Accidents or of the Things themſelves that are the Subjects of thoſe Accidents; becauſe, there is no one thing ſo like unto another, but it hath ſomething diſcernable by ſome one or other of the Senſes, whereby, it differs from all other things, beſides it ſelf; and may be known to doe ſo. Becauſe, a man may either want, or not have the perfect uſe of ſuch Senſes, whereby ſuch things are to be diſcerned; which made *Iſaac*, unable to diſtinguiſh betwixt *Jacob* and *Eſau* by his Sight, for *his Eyes were dim* ſaith the Text. Or *Secondly* the *Medium* betwixt the Senſe

★ *Supposing those things that are necessarily required to the act of seeing, as first an Organ or Eye well disposed, (2) that the* Medium *betwixt the Eye and the Object, be such as it ought to be; (3) that the Object or the thing which We are to see be within a convenient distance, that is neither too near nor too far from us.*

Senſe and the Object may be ſuch, that though the Senſe be never ſo perfect, yet it may not judge of its Object rightly; as when a ſtreight Stick, being looked upon in the Water, ſeems crooked, or any thing looked upon thorough a Red, Yellow, or Blew glaſs, ſeems to be red, blew, or yellow. Or *thirdly*, when the *Diſtance* betwixt the Senſe, and the Object is too near, and then We cannot diſcern at all; or too far off, and then We cannot diſcover either diſtinctly or exactly; which makes us take many times one thing for another, and the Stars to ſeem no bigger than ſo many Candles. Or *fourthly*, when a man doth not make uſe of all, or as many of his Senſes, as are needfull to be made uſe of, for the diſcerning, or diſtinguiſhing of ſuch an Object; or if he do make uſe of them, it is not with that diligence, and attention, as he ought to doe: and hence it is that Men are miſtaken for Spirits, and Spirits for Men; and the Legerdemain of Juglers, for true Miracles. Or *fifthly* and laſtly, when the Things that are preſented to our Senſes, are ſuch as We never were either by Experience or Reaſon acquainted with before: which was the Caſe of the Children of *Iſrael*, when they firſt ſaw *Manna*, for they knew not what it was (ſaith the Text,) therefore they called it *Manna*, which is as much as to ſay, *What is it?* but afterwards when they had been uſed to it, they did eaſily and infallibly

fallibly know it, and diſtinguiſh'd it by their Senſes, I mean by the *colour*, the *figure* and the *taſte* of it.

If it be further objected out of the Book of *Wiſedom* that *Manna* was not diſcernable by the taſte, becauſe (as 'tis ſaid there) *it taſted according to every man's own guſt*, or as every man would have it to taſte; I anſwer, that this proves but that the book of *Wiſedom* is *Apocryphal*; as contradicting the undoubtedly *Canonical* Scripture, which tells us that *the taſte of it was like Wafers, made with honey*. If it be replyed, that this doth the more prove, that the *Senſe* may be deceived, becauſe though it had a proper taſte of its own, yet men did not taſte it according to the taſte of the thing it ſelf, but every one taſted it according to his own particular taſte, and conſequently it was not to be known by its own taſte natural, and ſpecifical: I rejoyn, that this doth the more prove what is ſaid in the Book of *Wiſedom* to be but a *Rabbinical* conceit, and indeed a fabulous Tradition. For if it had not taſted to all alike, but ſo as every man deſired it ſhould taſte, or according to every man's own particular guſt or fancy, how is it poſſible that all or any of them ſhould have loathed it, as *Moſes* ſaid they did? it was therefore to them, as it was in it ſelf, always of one and the ſame taſte.

Wiſedom 16. v.20,21.

Exod.16.31.

I conclude therefore, that though (*poſitis omnibus ad ſenſationem requiſitis*) We cannot tell by our

our *Senſes* what things are, or how they differ from one another at firſt ſight, or at firſt hearing, or at firſt taſting, or upon any the firſt Eſſay, we take of them by any or all of our Senſes; yet when they are once grown into common uſe, and the *Accidents* (wherein they agree and wherein they differ,) are generally taken notice of, it is afterward impoſſible that *all the Senſes* of all mankind, ſhould *ſeverally* and *jointly*, and always, be miſtaken in them. And yet they muſt be ſo, if that which all mankind always, and at all times, *ſees*, and *feels*, and *ſmells*, and *taſtes* to be *Bread* and *Wine*, be indeed, neither Bread nor Wine, but, *Fleſh* and *Blood*.

For what is, or can be more known, than *Bread* and *Wine*? and therefore, if that which all men (if they may believe their *Senſes*) muſt needs conclude to be Bread and Wine, be not Bread and Wine, what uſe or certainty of *Senſe* can any man have in any thing elſe whatſoever? And if there be no Uſe or Certainty of *Senſe*, why doth God in the Scripture draw ſo many arguments, both for Inſtruction and Perſuaſion, ſometimes from the Senſe of *ſeeing*, and ſometimes from the Senſe of *hearing*? as for Example, *Take heed to thy ſelf* (ſaith *Moſes*, ſpeaking to the people of *Iſrael*) *and keep thy ſoul diligently, leſt thou forget the things which thine eyes have ſeen, but teach them thy Sons and thy Sons Sons.* Deut. 4. 9. But why ſhould he admoniſh them not to forget

things they had *ſeen*, if there were no certainty in *ſeeing?* or, to what purpoſe were they commanded to *teach* their Children, if there were no certainty in *hearing?* or if their Children, by hearing, could not be certain of what their Parents taught them? So that, to deny a certainty of *Senſe*, is to take away all poſſibility, both of learning our ſelves, and of inſtructing others.

Again, all matters of Controverſie, both *criminal* and *civil*, were by God's own appointment
Deut. 17. 6. to be decided, by the teſtimony of *two or three Witneſſes:* but, how could any may witneſs any thing, but what he had either *ſeen*, or *heard?* and conſequently, if he could not be ſure of what he *ſaw*, or *heard*, how could he be ſure, whether he did, or did not bear falſe witneſs? or how could the Judge be ſure whether he condemned an Innocent, or abſolved a Malefactour? So that to deny the Evidence and Certainty of *Senſe*, is to make it impoſſible to decide Controverſies, and to make God, the ſupreme Law-giver, to be the authour of ſuch a form of Tryal, whereby it is always impoſſible to diſcern betwixt the Innocent and the Guilty, though the *Witneſſes* be never ſo conſcientious; nor for the Witneſſes themſelves, to know whether they ſwear falſely or truly, when they have done all they can for their own Information.

Again, if there be no Certainty of *Senſe*, why doth *Chriſt* upbraid *Chorazim* and *Bethſaida* for not

not believing, after they had *ſeen* ſo many miracles done amongſt them; ſeeing, if there be no Certainty of *Senſe*, they could not tell, whether any miracles had been done amongſt them, or no? Again, if there be no Evidence, or Certainty of *Senſe*; why doth St. *John*, to prove the *Incarnation*, or that *the Word was made fleſh*, tell us, that He, and the reſt of the Apoſtles had not onely *heard*, but *ſeen* with their Eyes, and looked upon, and *handled* with their hands the word of life? or why doth the *Angel*, to prove the *Reſurrection*, ſay to *Mary Magdalene*, *He is not here, he is riſen: come ſee the place where the Lord lay?* thereby inferring, that if he could not be *ſeen*, he was not there, which is a ſhrewd Inference againſt *Tranſubſtantiation.* Nay why doth *Chriſt* himſelf, to prove that he roſe again with the ſame body, that was crucified, bid *Thomas to put his finger into the print of the nails, and to thruſt his hand into his ſide*; if there had not been a greater Evidence, and a more convincing Certainty, of *Senſe*, than of any other Argument whatſoever? Matt. 28. 6.

Once more; why was *Chriſt* taken up into heaven, in the *ſight* and view of his Diſciples; but, that there might be the greater Evidence and Certainty of his *Aſcenſion?* and how could their *ſeeing* of it, make it more evident and certain, if they were not evidently and infallibly certain of what they ſaw? or why doth St. *Luke*

Luke 1. 2. and St. *Peter*, the one ſay that *he received what he wrote from thoſe that were Eye-witneſſes*; and the
2 Pet. 1. 16. other ſay that *he was an Eye-witneſs himſelf of what he writ concerning Chriſt*, if they had not both thought that a Man could not be *more* certain, or rather *ſo* certain, of any thing, as of that whereof he is an *Eye-witneſs?* and conſequently that there could not be a greater Evidence, or Certainty, than that of *Senſe*, to aſſure us of, and confirm us in, the truth, even of the *Goſpel* it ſelf, and the higheſt Myſteries of our *Faith*.

To conclude; if there be not a Certainty of *Senſe*, why was the *Goſpel written*, that it might be *read?* or why is it *preached*, that it may be *heard?* To what purpoſe were *true Miracles* wrought at firſt, or why are *falſe Miracles* pretended ſince? nay, why doth that *Church*, which would be thought *Infallible*, endeavour to prove her ſelf to be the *true Church*, by ſuch *Notes*, as (if there be not a Certainty of *Senſe*) ſhe muſt needs confeſs to be *fallible*; as *Antiquity*, *Succeſſion*, external *Unity*, and *Univerſality*, together with power of working *Miracles*, and perpetual *Viſibility*; none of which can be proved, but by the help of *Senſe?* and certainly, if the *Proof* be *fallible*, whatſoever is pretended to be proved by it, muſt be fallible alſo. Indeed, if *Senſe* be *fallible*, all things depending upon Senſe, muſt of neceſſity be ſo; for the Knowledge of them muſt be as fallible at leaſt, as *Senſe* is: So that to deny the

the Evidence and Certainty of *Senſe*, is in effect to deny that there is a Poſſibility, either of *Learning*, or of *Teaching*, or of *Knowing*, or of *Believing* any thing whatſoever; and conſequently, to hold a Neceſſity of being a perfect *Sceptick*, not onely in all other *Arts* and *Sciences* belonging unto humane Life, but in *Divinity* it ſelf alſo. And yet this beſides many other Abſurdities and Contradictions muſt needs follow upon the *Church of Rome*'s Interpretation of theſe words (*Hoc eſt corpus meum*) or the doctrine of *Tranſubſtantiation*, which affirms, that to be *fleſh* and *blood* (which if there be any Certainty in our Senſes) muſt needs be *Bread* and *Wine*. And if there be no Certainty in our Senſes, I would fain learn how they come to know it to be the *body* and *blood* of Chriſt. For it muſt be either becauſe they are immediately *Inſpired*, or becauſe they *reade* it in the *Scripture*, or becauſe they *hear* it from the *Church*. But to immediate *Inſpiration*, they do not yet pretend; and if there be no Certainty of Senſe, it is impoſſible for them to learn it, either from the *Scripture*, or from the *Church*; becauſe it is not poſſible for them to be ſure, either of what they *reade* in the one, or *hear* from the other; whence it follows that *their Interpretation of that place of Scripture*, (becauſe it neceſſarily implyes a fallibility of Senſe in an object of Senſe) *muſt needs fruſtrate and make void the uſe and end of all Scripture*, and

of the Church it ſelf alſo; and conſequently *this Interpretation is not a true one:* ὅπερ ἔδει δεῖξαι, which is that which was to be proved.

Now if there be no *Tranſubſtantiation* (as if there be any Truth and Certainty in *Senſe*, there is not) let *Coſterus* the Jeſuite tell you what will be the Conſequence. For * *Si non detur* (ſaith he) *Tranſubſtantiatio, tolerabilior foret eorum error, qui pro Deo colunt Statuam auream, aut alterius materiæ Imaginem, quomodo Gentiles Deos ſuos venerabantur, vel pannum rubrum in haſtam elevatum, quod de Lappis dicitur, vel viva animalia, ut quondam Ægyptii; quàm eorum, qui fruſtulum Panis adorant:* and conſequently the *Papiſts* are as groſs, or groſſer *Idolaters*, than ever any of the *Heathen* were, in the opinion of their own *Jeſuite*, or at leaſt, in the neceſſary conſequence of it.

* *Conſterus* in Enchiridio controvers.

If there be no Tranſubſtantiation, their Errour who worſhip for God, an Image of Gold, or any other matter, as the Gentiles worſhipped their Gods: or that worſhip a Red Cloth upon the top of a Spear, as (they ſay) the Laplanders do, or that worſhip living creatures as the Ægyptians were wont to doe; is much more tolerable than their Errour is that worſhip a piece of Bread.

FINIS.

A VINDICATION OF THE ARGUMENT Drawn from SENSE, AGAINST Tranſubſtantiation,

From a pretended Anſwer to it, by the Authour of a Pamphlet, called, *A Treatiſe of the nature of Catholick Faith and Hereſie*, Cap. XI. p. 54, 55, 56.

By *G. Morley*, D. D.

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA LIBRARY CAMBRIDGE

LONDON,
Printed for *Joanna Brome*. 1683.

A

VINDICATION

OF THE

ARGUMENT

DRAWN FROM

SENSE,

Or, a

Translation,

From a pretended Answer, by the Author of a Pamphlet, called, A Treatise of the nature of Catholick Faith and Heresie, Cap. XI. p. 54, 55, 56.

By G: More, D. D.

LONDON,
Printed for Joanna Brome. 1683.

A Vindication of the Argument drawn from Senſe, *againſt* Tranſubſtantiation, *from a pretended Anſwer to it, by the Authour of a Pamphlet, called,* A Treatiſe of the nature of Catholick Faith and Hereſie, *Cap. XI.* p. 54, 55, 56.



THE nameleſs *Authour* of a worthleſs *Pamphlet* (called *A Treatiſe of the nature of Catholick Faith and Hereſie*) tells us, that the *Anſwer* to this *Argument* from the Certainty and Evidence of *Senſe*, is very eaſie; ſuppoſing (which he takes for granted and undeniable,) That there be *two* ſorts of *Miracles*, namely, *ſome* wrought by God, to make us believe ſomething elſe; and theſe (ſaith he) muſt be Evident unto the *Senſes*, or (as his phraſe is) cannot deceive the Senſes: and *others* to be believed themſelves; and theſe (ſaith he) muſt not appear evidently to our Senſes, but rather are to be concealed from them, (he ſhould have added, *and may deceive the Senſes*; in oppoſition to that other ſort of Miracles, which (he ſaith) cannot deceive the Senſes.) Otherwiſe We ſhould have *Evidence* and *Belief* of the ſame thing at the ſame time. And ſuch Miracles (ſaith he) are thoſe which together are myſteries of

Faith, or which are *Myſteries* as well as *Miracles*; and of this latter ſort of miracles he gives us two Inſtances; namely *Chriſt's Incarnation*, or the Union of God and Man, in one Perſon; and *Tranſubſtantiation*, which, as he ſaith, is called *myſterium fidei* by Chriſt himſelf, and whereof *Manna* being a Figure did (as he ſaith) favour to the *Jews* whatſoever they fancyed, though it remained the ſame ſubſtance it was before. And he ſees no reaſon, why We *Chriſtians* ſhould give more credit to our Palate than the *Jews*, who had as much reaſon to doubt of the *Manna* as We of the *Sacrament*.

He adds that the not manifeſting of this *myſtery* to our *Senſes*, requireth that the *Species* or appearances of *Bread* and *Wine* work the ſame effects, which their *Subſtances* would have done, if they had been preſent.

And becauſe, ſuppoſing there is ſuch a miracle as *Tranſubſtantiation*; the body of Chriſt muſt needs be in as many places at once, as there be *Maſſes* ſaid at a time in the whole World; therefore he tells us, that though ſome *Proteſtants* think it a contradiction, that One body be preſent in many places together, yet all *Catholicks* hold that Chriſt's *body* and *blood* have a *Spiritual preſence* in the *Sacrament*, which once granted there can be no difficulty (ſaith he) to believe, that our Saviour's *body* and *blood* may be in many places at the ſame time, becauſe its granted

ted to all things which have a *Spiritual preſence.*

And laſtly, if any enquires (ſaith he) *how can a body have a ſpiritual preſence?* I anſwer him with demanding *how can an Angel have the appearance and preſence of a young man?* Whereof there are many examples in Scripture: whence it follows, that our *Senſes* may be deceived; or to ſpeak more properly may give occaſion to our Underſtanding to be deceived, not onely in the myſtery of *Tranſubſtantiation*, but alſo in others, which is contrary to what our Adverſaries object: in that *Angels* ſeemed to the Eyes of *Abraham*, *Joſhua* and *Tobias* to be young men, and yet they were not *Men* but *Spirits.*

Now this being all that this *Authour* can ſay, and as much in effect as can be ſaid in *Anſwer* to the aforeſaid *Argument*, and all this having no other foundation to ſupport it, but a ſuppoſed *diſtinction* of *Miracles*, into ſuch as are evident, and ſuch as are not evident to the *Senſes:* if there be no ſuch diſtinction of miracles, all the reſt that is here ſaid, muſt be to no purpoſe; for he himſelf (p. 54.) grants that the common Anſwer to this *Argument*, namely, that *the Senſes are not deceived in their proper Objects (which are the remaining Accidents)* is not ſatisfactory; becauſe diverſe both *Catholicks* and *Proteſtants* do deny, that there be any *Accidents* ſeparable from their proper *Subſtance.* So that (as I ſaid before) if there be no ſuch inviſible, inſenſible and imperceptible

ble Miracle (as this *diſtinction* ſuppoſeth there is) the *Argument* from the evidence of *Senſe* againſt *Tranſubſtantiation* remains unanſwered, and (for ought I can foreſee) unanſwerable.

Firſt therefore I affirm, that this ſuppoſed *diſtinction* (though it be in *Thomas Aquinas* p.3. q.29. 1. 2$^{dæ.}$) is not to be admitted or granted.

1. Becauſe no ſuch *diſtinction of Miracles* is to be found in the Goſpel; for all the miracles that are there ſpoken of, whether done by *Chriſt's Apoſtles*, or by *Chriſt* himſelf, are of the *firſt ſort* onely, namely ſuch as were Evident to the *Senſes*. And therefore we that have learned of St. *Paul*, *not to be Wiſe above that which is Written*, eſpecially in matters appertaining unto *Faith*, can acknowledge no other *miracles*, but ſuch as the *Scripture* calls miracles, and thoſe are ſuch, and none but ſuch, as were evident to the *Senſes*.

2. Becauſe this *diſtinction of Miracles* into ſuch as are, and ſuch as are not perceivable by the *Senſes*, cannot conſiſt with that *End*, which the *Scripture* makes to be the onely end of all miracles, which was to make men believe thoſe Truths (which their Reaſon could not comprehend the reaſon of) to be from God, being evidently atteſted by ſuch Works, as could not be done but by God; as it appears by *Chriſt's* promiſe

miſe *Mark* 16. 17, 18, 20. and by the *Apoſtles* Prayer *Acts* 4. 30. as likewiſe of Saint *Paul* 1 *Cor.* 14. 22. where he tells us that *Tongues* (he means the miraculous ſpeaking of ſeveral Languages, which a man had never been taught to ſpeak) was *for a Sign*, or for a miraculous Evidence of God's power *not to them that believe, but to them that believe not*; namely, in order to their Converſion, or for making them of unbelievers, to become Believers. And what St. *Paul* affirms of that one miracle in *particular* muſt *à paritate rationis* be affirmed of all miracles in *general*, namely that they are Signs, or Evidences to convince unbelievers of the truth of what they *hear*, by the wonderfulneſs of what they *ſee*. Neither can any *Inſtance* be given of any one miracle in Scripture, that was wrought either for no end at all but to be believed it ſelf, or for any other end than this, namely, to make ſomething elſe to be believed.

3. Becauſe this *diſtinction of Miracles*, though (as I ſaid before) it be borrowed from *Thomas Aquinas*, yet is it inconſiſtent with *Thomas*'s own doctrine, concerning the denomination, and nature of a miracle, (*par.* 1. *Q.* 105. 7. *C.*) where he tells us, that a *Miracle* hath its name from *Admiration*, or from mens admiring of it; adding that this admiration of ours ariſeth from the manifeſtation of an *effect* to us, whoſe *cauſe*

is concealed from us: as (ſaith he) when a man ſees the *Eclipſe* of the Sun, and knows not the cauſe of it, which though it do not prove the *Eclipſe* it ſelf to be a *miracle*, becauſe there is a natural cauſe to be known of it, and therefore he adds, that *miraculum dicitur quaſi admiratione plenum*, that is, A miracle is ſo called, becauſe it is full of Wonder in it ſelf, the cauſe thereof being ſimply and equally unknown unto all Men: yet is it evident from this Inſtance and Illuſtration of his; *firſt*, that where there is no matter of *Admiration*, there is no *Miracle*: and (2^dly.) that when the *Effect*, or thing that is done is not manifeſt, there is no ground of *Admiration*: for how can We admire the doing of any thing which We do not perceive to be done? as likewiſe, how can We chuſe but admire when We perceive a thing to be done, and cannot imagine how it ſhould be done? And this may further, and more fully appear by *Thomas* himſelf by his *anſwer* to an *objection* of his own making in the ſame place. His *Objection* or Argument is this; That all things that are done by the Divine power contrary to the Ordinary courſe of Nature, are not *Miracles*. The *Medium* or reaſon by which he proves it, is, Becauſe there be ſome things done contrary to the courſe of Nature which are not manifeſt to the *Senſe*; but ſo all *Miracles*, ſaith he, muſt needs be, as having their name from *Admiration*, and all admiration being

being from things manifeſt to the *Senſe*. And the *Inſtance* he gives of ſomething done contrary to the courſe of Nature, and yet not evident to the Senſe, is the miraculouſly infuſed Knowledge wherewithall the *Apoſtles* were inſpired. Now in his *Anſwer* to this *Objection*, he denies neither the *Medium* nor the *Inſtance*. I mean he denies not that either the *Apoſtles* inſpired Knowledge was a Miracle, or done contrary to the ordinary courſe of nature, or that a *Miracle* hath its name from admiration, and that there is no *admiration* but from things manifeſt to the *Senſes*; but he denies that the *Inſtance* in the *Objection*, namely, the *Apoſtles* infuſed Knowledge was not manifeſt unto the Senſes; affirming that it was manifeſt to the Senſe, though not in it ſelf, yet by the Effects of it, *ex quibus*, ſaith he, *mirabilis apparebat*, that is, from which effects ſo manifeſted, it appear'd wonderfull or became a *Miracle*. So that by this *Anſwer* of his to that Objection, it appears, that notwithſtanding the *Apoſtolical* Knowledge was a *preternatural* or a *ſupernatural* Effect; yet if it had not been ſome way or other evidenced to the *Senſe*, he muſt have granted it to be no Miracle. And what is this but as much as in plain terms to ſay, that where there is no matter of *admiration* there is no *miracle*, and where there is no manifeſtation of what is done unto the *Senſe*, there is no ground of *admiration*, and conſequently no *miracle* neither; though the Work

it

it ſelf do never ſo much tranſcend or croſs the courſe of Nature? So that to tranſcend the efficacy of Nature, or to be done ſo as naturally a thing uſeth not to be done, is according to *Thomas*, in this place, but the *materiale* of a Miracle, or that which may be a miracle; but the appearance of it to be ſo, or the manifeſtation of it that it is ſo, is the *formale* or that which makes it indeed to be a Miracle; otherwiſe there had been no need of thoſe ſenſible Effects (as *Thomas* by his Anſwer to that Objection confeſſeth there was) to make the Apoſtles inſpired or infuſed Knowledge to be a Miracle. And therefore according to *Thomas*'s own doctrine, it muſt be confeſſed, that in this caſe *idem eſt non apparere & non eſſe*; that is, where there is no appearance there is no miracle. And if this be ſo, I am ſure, there can be no more ground in *Nature*, than there is in *Scripture*, for the ſuppoſed *diſtinction of miracles*, into ſuch as are and are not Evident to the *Senſe*; it being all one as if one ſhould diſtinguiſh *Miracles* into ſuch as are miracles, and into ſuch as are no miracles.

But how then, will you ſay, can *Thomas*, ſo acute a man, ſo contradict himſelf, as having firſt made it of the Eſſence of all *Miracles* to be manifeſt, to tell us afterwards, that there be ſome miracles that are not manifeſt? I anſwer, *firſt*, that perhaps he did not then think of the Doctrine

Doctrine of *Tranſubſtantiation.* And (2*dly*,) he may as well contradict himſelf in the doctrine of *Miracles* (as he and the reſt of them do in the doctrine of *Accidents* in general, and of *Quantity* in particular; as likewiſe in the doctrine concerning *Bodies* or bodily ſubſtances.

For firſt ſpeaking of *Accidents* in general (p. 1. q. 90. 2. c.) He tells us, *quòd Accidens non habet eſſe niſi quia eo aliquid eſt*, That an Accident hath no being but as ſomething that hath a being is affected with it or denominated by it; *ut albedo dicitur Ens quia aliquid eſt album*, as Whiteneſs (ſaith he) is ſaid to have a being, becauſe of ſomething that is White; and conſequently (as it follows in the ſame place) *Accidens eſt Entis magis quam Ens*, An Accident is rather that which belongs to an Entity, than an Entity it ſelf; which is all one as in plain terms to ſay with *Ariſtotle*, and all Philoſophers, that *Accident* is *eſſe eſt ineſſe*; or that an *Accident* cannot be at all unleſs it be in ſome *Subject* or other. And yet to ſalve not the miraculous but monſtrous doctrine of *Tranſubſtantiation*, he is fain to hold there be ſome *Accidents* (namely thoſe of Bread and Wine after Conſecration) that are in no ſubject at all.

And in the like manner, though he, and all the reſt of them teach, that *Quantity* in all other bodily ſubſtances hath extention of parts, or *partes extra partes*, even in reſpect of place, yet for the aforeſaid reaſon, they are fain to hold

that the quantity of *Chriſt's body* in the *Sacrament*, hath either no extention of parts at all, or at leaſt not *in ordine ad locum*, as all other bodies have, and as his own body in Heaven (which is one and the ſame (ſay they) with that in the Sacrament) hath by their own confeſſion. So that the *Quantity* of one and the ſame body, at one and the ſame time, hath a local and real Extention in one place, and no local, and conſequently no real, but an imaginary phantaſtical extention of parts in another place.

Thus laſtly, though *Thomas* and all the reſt of them teach, that there is no other *Body* that is or can be in more places than one, at one time, yet they teach too, that *Chriſt's body* as it is in the *Sacrament*, though it have the ſame dimenſions that all other humane bodies have, may be, and is in divers places at once, though not *localiter* (as *Thomas* ſaith) but *ſacramentaliter* onely; and all this, that they may ſeem at leaſt διλεκτικῶς ἐφιστάνειν, to maintain what their *Church* hath defin'd, and will have them maintain, though it cannot be done without doing Violence to all the Principles not of *Divinity* onely, but of *Nature*, *Senſe* and *Reaſon*, and not without manifeſt and manifold Contradictions not of one another onely, but even of themſelves alſo.

But now in the ſecond place, ſuppoſing, but not granting, that according to this *diſtinction* of theirs,

theirs, there were ſome *Miracles* not evident to the Senſe, and that all Myſteries that are miracles were ſuch miracles; what good will this doe them unleſs they can make it appear, that in the *Sacrament* there is ſuch a *Myſtery*, and *Miracle*, as likewiſe that *Tranſubſtantiation* is that *Myſtery* and that *Miracle?*

For *firſt*, They will not ſay that all *Myſteries* are *Miracles*, unleſs They will deny the Doctrines of the *Trinity*, of the *Creation* of the World, of the *Redemption* of Mankind, of the *Regeneration* and *Juſtification* of Sinners, and of the *myſtical Union* betwixt Chriſt and his Church, to be *Myſteries*; for ſure none of theſe are, or can properly be called *Miracles*; becauſe, though they tranſcend the Efficacy, yet they are not within the Sphere of *Nature*, and conſequently cannot be ſaid to be done *præter ordinem naturæ*, which according to *Thomas* and the whole Schools, is a neceſſary requiſite to all *Miracles.*

Secondly, Though this *Authour* do ſay it, yet it cannot truly be ſaid, that all thoſe *Myſteries* that are Miracles are ſuch miracles as are not nor muſt not be Evident to the *Senſe*; for ſurely *Chriſt's Paſſion*, *Reſurrection* and *Aſcenſion*, together with the Deſcent of the *holy Ghoſt* upon the Apoſtles, are all of them *Myſteries*, and ſuch myſteries (at leaſt the three laſt) as were *Miracles* alſo; and yet they were all Evident to the *Senſe*, and their being Evident to the Senſe is (as

I have ſaid already in the *Argument* it ſelf) recorded in Scripture as a ſpecial Motive to perſuade us to the Belief of them. For there may be *Belief* and *Evidence* of the ſame thing at the ſame time, (whatſoever this *Pamphleteer* ſaith to the contrary) as appears by *Thomas* his *believing* upon his *ſeeing*, and *feeling*, (or where and what he *ſaw* and *felt*) the Body, and the Wounds in the body of our Saviour; for ſure, there was both an *Evidence*, and a *Belief* at the ſame time of the ſame thing, *viz.* that this was Chriſt's body, and the ſame body that was crucified. And our own Reſurrection which St. *Paul* calls a *myſtery* (1 *Cor.* 15. 51.) and We all confeſs to be a *miracle*, is ſuch a miracle, as will be evident and viſible to all men; and therefore a *miracle* though it be a *myſtery*, may be Evident to the *Senſe*, nay it muſt be evident to the Senſe, though it be a *myſtery*, if it be a *miracle*. Neither doth this *Pamphleteer* give any Inſtance to the contrary (beſides that in queſtion) but one onely, and that is the *Incarnation* of our Saviour which I confeſs to be a *myſtery*, but deny to be a *miracle*, as being *extra ſphæram*, and ſo not *præter ordinem naturæ*; for which reaſon *Aquinas* denies the *Creation* of the World, and the *Juſtification* of a Sinner, to be Miracles, though they do tranſcend the Efficacy of Nature as well as the *Incarnation*: and yet the *Incarnation* it ſelf, or the Union of God and Man in one Perſon,

was

was viſible (as *Aquinas* ſaith of the Apoſtolical infuſed Knowledge) by the Effects of it; his *Deity*, by his doing ſuch things as none but *God* could doe; and his *Humanity* by ſuffering that which none but a *Man* could ſuffer. And therefore St. *John* ſpeaking of the *Incarnation*, tells us not onely, that *the Word was made fleſh*, but that it was manifeſt that it was ſo; for *We ſaw*, ſaith he, *his glory, the glory, as of the onely begotten of the Father*, (*Joh.* 1. 14.) nay farther, in one of his *Epiſtles*, ſpeaking of the ſame thing, he ſaith that he, and the reſt of the Apoſtles had not onely *ſeen with their eyes*, but *handled with their hands the Word of life*, or him whom they manifeſtly diſcerned, by what he ſaid, and by what he did, to be the Word of life. Laſtly, St. *Paul* ſpeaking of the *Incarnation* alſo, ſaith, Θεὸς ἐφανερώθη ἐν σαρκὶ, *God was manifeſted in the fleſh*, that is, the Veil of his fleſh did not ſo cover, or obſcure his Deity, but that it manifeſtly appeared in it, and ſhined through it (1 *Tim.* 3. 16.) So that though *Tranſubſtantiation* were a *myſtery*, yet if it were a *miracle*, nay ſuch a miracle as were to be believed for it ſelf onely, yet it might be, and would be Manifeſt to the *Senſes*, at leaſt by the Effects of it.

But the truth is, that *Tranſubſtantiation* is neither a *Myſtery* nor a *Miracle*. Not a *Myſtery*, unleſs it be one of the Petty myſteries of that Grand *Myſtery of Iniquity* St. *Paul* ſpeaks of 2 *Theſſ.* 2. 7.

though the *Authour* of this *Pamphlet* hath the Impudence to tell us, *that it is called a Myſtery of Faith by Chriſt himſelf*; which is as true as the Fable of the *Nagg's-head*, and both fit to be aſſerted by the ſame *Authour*, and yet he writes it with that confidence, as if Chriſt had named the Word *Tranſubſtantiation*, and called it in expreſs terms a *myſtery of Faith*; Whereas there is nothing like it either in ſound or in ſenſe ſaid by Chriſt in any of the four Goſpels. For ſuppoſing *Chriſt's* ſaying *This is my body* muſt needs imply *Tranſubſtantiation* (which We utterly deny) yet doth not *Chriſt* tell us of any *Myſtery* that he means by it: nay he doth not name the word *Myſtery* there, or any where elſe but twice onely, and that is *Matt.* 13. 11. and *Mark* 14. 11. and both in relation to the ſame *Parable*, namely, that of the *ſower*, who never ſowed the ſeed of *Tranſubſtantiation*, but that was one of the *Tares*, that the Envious man ſowed afterwards. Indeed the word *Myſtery* is often uſed in Scripture by *Chriſt* and his *Apoſtles*; ſometimes for the whole *Chriſtian doctrine*, as it is by *Chriſt* himſelf in the two places before named, and by St. *Paul* in very many places of his Epiſtles, as *Rom.* 16. 25. *Eph.* 1. 9. *Col.* 1. 26. 1 *Tim.* 3. 9. in all which places, and many more, the whole *Goſpel* or whole *Chriſtian doctrine* both of Faith, and Manners, is called ſometimes a *Myſtery* ſimply, ſometimes *the Revelation of the myſtery*, and ſometimes

the

the Myſtery of God, the Myſtery of Chriſt, the Myſtery of Faith and *the Myſtery of Godlineſs:* becauſe it had been till *Chriſt*'s coming hid from all the world but the *Jews*, and from them in part alſo; the Word *Myſtery* ſignifying ſomething that is, or has been hidden. And becauſe there be ſome things in the *Chriſtian doctrine* that are more ſublime, abſtruſe and obſcure than others, as more tranſcending the capacity, and comprehenſion of humane Reaſon, therefore are they more peculiarly, and more emphatically called by the name of *Myſteries*; as namely the *Incarnation* and *Aſcenſion* of our Saviour (1 *Tim.* 3. 16.) the *Reſurrection* from the dead (1 *Cor.* 15. 51.) and all the reſt of thoſe high points that are contained in the *Apoſtles*, the *Nicene*, and the *Athanaſian Creeds*, in none of which (no more than in the *Scripture*) is there any mention or any intimation at all of this pretended Myſtery of *Tranſubſtantiation*, as no doubt there would have been, if it had been one of the *Myſteries of* that *Catholick* or common *Faith* of Chriſtians, which was firſt and once for all delivered to the Saints, and afterward comprehended and declared in the three *Creeds* before named. And therefore if it be a *Myſtery*, it muſt be, as I ſaid before, and as indeed it is, a part of that which St. *Paul* calls *the Myſtery of Iniquity* 2 *Theſſ.* 2. 7. and St. *John* the *Myſtery of Babylon* (*Rev.* 17. 5.) for though it be none of the *Myſteries*

ries of the *Catholick faith*, yet it is one of the prime myſteries of the *Roman faith*, as it is contained in the Articles of the *new Creed*, publiſhed and enjoyned to be believed by Pope *Pius* the 4th. in which new Creed (as Dr. *Cozens* ſaith) conſiſteth the very life and being of the peculiar and proper *Religion* of the *Church of Rome*, as it differs from ours and the true *Catholick Religion* of every Church and every Age before. And ſuch a *myſtery* I confeſs the doctrine of *Tranſubſtantiation* may be, and is; for a *Myſtery* may be taken in a bad ſenſe as well as in a good; and for one of the *depths of Satan* (*Rev.* 2. 24.) as well as for one of the *arcana* or ſublime myſteries of *Chriſt:* and that this is one of the *depths* or myſteries *of Satan* may appear, becauſe it is not onely inconſiſtent with but deſtructive to ſome of the main Articles of the *Chriſtian faith*, as namely to the truth of *Chriſt*'s humane nature, and to his *Aſcenſion* and ſitting at the right hand of God; and beſides doth by conſequence and in practice introduce that *Idolatrous worſhip* of the Creature, inſtead of the Creatour, of *bread* inſtead of *Chriſt.*

In the mean time I deny not but that the *Sacraments*, though not in *Scripture*, yet in the Writings of the *Fathers*, are often called *Myſteries*, and that in a more ſpecial notion than other parts of the *Chriſtian doctrine* and *worſhip*; partly, as the word *myſtery* is derived from μύειν, which

which ſignifies *ſacris initiare*, to initiate a man into Religion: becauſe the *Sacraments* are thoſe holy *Rites* and *Ceremonies* whereby We are initiated into the *Chriſtian Religion*, and diſtinguiſhed from all other Religions: and thus both the *Sacraments* (eſpecially that of *Baptiſm*) may be and are called *Myſteries*: and partly (as the word *myſtery* is derived from μύειν *claudere*, *occultare*, to conceal or to be concealed) becauſe thoſe holy *Rites* and *Ceremonies* as they are *myſterious* in themſelves (being *outward and viſible ſigns of inward and inviſible grace*, as St. *Auſtin* calls them) ſo was the *adminiſtration* of them concealed from all but ſuch as were partakers of them; and in this ſenſe likewiſe both the *Sacraments* may be and are called *Myſteries*, but eſpecially that of the *Lord's Supper*, which none were permitted to be preſent at, or to ſee adminiſtred, in the *Primitive Church* of old, nor are not in *Proteſtant Churches* at this day, but ſuch as are receivers and partakers of it. And from hence the word *Miſſa* or *Maſſe* came to be taken for the *Sacrament* it ſelf; becauſe when that part of the *divine ſervice* (which was before the *Sacrament*, and at which the *Catechumeni* and others (that were not to be partakers of the *Sacrament*) might be preſent)

was done, the *Deacon* diſmiſſed that part of the People by ſaying *Miſſa eſt*, that is, Your part of the Service is done, and you are to depart; and then none ſtaid but ſuch as were to communicate, whom they called *fideles*. But that which was not lawfull and counted a prophanation of this holy myſtery in the *Primitive Church*, is now in the *Romiſh* not onely counted lawfull but meritorious; I mean the ſtanding by, and looking on the celebration of the *Lord's Supper* or the *Maſſe* (as they call it) without receiving of it.

And theſe were the reaſons, why the *Fathers* called the Sacraments *myſteries*, without dreaming of *Tranſubſtantiation*, or of any ſubſtantial change of the Elements, or of the ſigns into the thing ſignified in the one Sacrament more than in the other.

To conclude (as the learned *Caſaubon* obſerves and proves, *pag.* 559. of his *Exercitations againſt Baronius*) it was not the thing ſignified, but the holy *Symbols* and ſigns, together with the *Rites* and forms that were uſed in the Celebration of the *Sacraments*, that were concealed from all that were not partakers of them; and conſequently in reſpect whereof, and not in reſpect of the thing ſignified, the *Sacraments* themſelves were called *myſte-*

myſteries; from which obſervation it is evident, that according to the *Fathers*, there is no ſuch *myſtery* as *Tranſubſtantiation.*

And as there is no ſuch *Myſtery*, ſo there is no ſuch *Miracle* neither.

1. Becauſe the *Scripture* makes no mention at all of any *miracle* in this *Sacrament*, as no doubt it would have done, if there had been any; eſpecially, if there had been ſuch a miracle as no man can perceive to be there, and conſequently can have no reaſon to believe it is there, unleſs God himſelf had told us ſo.

2. Becauſe if there be a *miracle*, yet it can be no ſuch miracle as this of *Tranſubſtantiation*, not onely becauſe (as *We* ſay) there is no miracle but is evident to the *Senſe* (which evidently and confeſſedly this is not) but alſo becauſe (as *They* ſay) there be but two ſorts of *miracles*, the one Evident to the Senſe, and the other Concealed from the Senſe; but this ſuppoſed miracle of *Tranſubſtantiation* is not onely Concealed from the Senſe, but directly Contrary to the Senſe, which is a third *ſpecies* of Miracles of which they can give no

inſtance either in ſuch things as are *miracles* onely, or *miracles* and *myſteries* alſo. For God though he will have us believe many things that do not appear to our *Senſes*, yet he obligeth no man to believe any thing contrary to that which is Evident to his own and all mens Senſes; for this were to oblige him to believe one thing which would deſtroy the foundation of his belief in all things. There can therefore be no ſuch *miracle* as *Tranſubſtantiation*; becauſe upon that ſuppoſition We muſt be obliged, not onely to believe that to be there which We do not ſee (*viz.*) the *fleſh* and the *blood* of *Chriſt*, but likewiſe that which We do ſee there, not to be there, *viz.* the *Bread* and *Wine*; nay, that the thing which We do ſee is not that which We do ſee, but ſomething elſe, which We do not ſee; and ſuch a *Miracle*, ſay I then, was never any of God's making; and conſequently, it muſt needs be a figment of their own fancy.

Neither doth this *Authour*'s Inſtance of *Manna* or of *Angels* appearing like Men, prove that our *Senſes* may be deceived in other things, as well as they are, and muſt needs be deceived, ſuppoſing *Tranſubſtantiation.* For, *firſt*, that *Manna*, though it had a pro-

a proper taſte of its own, yet that it did ſavour to the *Jews* whatſoever they fancied, is a falſe and ridiculous Aſſertion directly contrary to the expreſs words of *Scripture*, which tells us, that as the *Colour of it* was *white like Coriander-ſeed*, ſo the *Taſte of it* was *like Wafers made with hony*, *Exod.* 16. 31. And if the *taſte* of it was not one and the ſame to all that eat it, but according as every man fancied, how came they to *loath* it, as we reade they did, *Numb.* 22. 5? For ſure if it taſted as they fancied, they would never have *loathed* it, as being in their power to give it what taſte they pleaſed: but they taſted it as it was, and loathed it becauſe having eaten of it ſo long they were cloyed with it; as *Solomon* tells us, *a full Soul loaths the Hony-comb*; that is, any food though it be never ſo delicious or well taſted. So that if our Palates be no more deceived than the *Jews* were, that which We taſte in the *Sacrament* is as We by our taſte find it to be, and that is *Bread*. and not fleſh, *Wine* and not blood.

I know it may be anſwered, what is here ſaid of *Manna* by the *Authour* of this *Pamphlet*, is taken out of the book of *Wiſedom*, 16. 20. and that this Book is of great Authority, even with thoſe that do not think it

to be *Canonical.* I confeſs that it is ſo, and that it is written with great Wiſedom and Eloquence in the general; but withall, I affirm that the Authour of it, (which *Jerome* and others think was *Philo* the *Jew*) being neither *Solomon* nor any other of thoſe immediately inſpired Writers, might be and evidently was miſtaken in this which he writes of *Manna*, which it ſeems was one of the *Jewiſh Traditions* in his time, but ſuch a *Tradition* (as many other of their Traditions were) directly contrary to the truth of the *Hiſtory* of the undoubted divine Text of *Moſes*; and therefore (if there were no other) this one Argument is enough to prove this Book of *Wiſedom* not to be *Canonical*, or not to be written by the ſame Spirit that dictated the Books of *Moſes.*

Again, As to the *apparition of Angels* with bodies like *Men*; I anſwer that either they were indeed true and ſolid *Bodies*, and then the Eye was not deceived in judging them to be bodies, neither was he that ſaw them obliged to believe them to be other than they appeared to be, till by ſomething they ſaid or did, he were convinced they were *Angels* with aſſumed Bodies; or elſe they were but *Appearances* onely of true Bodies, which I rather believe, becauſe *Chriſt* ſpeaking of *Spirits*

its in general, *Luke* 24. 39. ſaith *a Spirit hath not fleſh and bones*; and then though they could not have diſcerned them from *Men* by one of their Senſes (*viz.*) their ſight, yet they might have diſcerned them by another of their Senſes (*viz.*) their touch, or feeling: otherwiſe (as I ſaid before) the κριτηριον or means to diſcern betwixt a *body* and a *ſpirit*, which *Chriſt* himſelf aſſigned, muſt needs be falſe or inſufficient. But ſuppoſing *Tranſubſtantiation*, not onely *one* but *all* the *Senſes* of all mankind muſt be deceived, and deceived always in an object of Senſe; which is incredible.

(3*dly*) There is no ſuch Miracle as *Tranſubſtantiation*, becauſe God never works any *miracle*, but for ſome great and good *End*, and ſuch a one, as cannot be obtained without ſuch a miracle, according to the old and true ſaying, both in Philoſophy and Divinity, *Deus nihil agit fruſtra*, God doth nothing in vain. But ſuppoſing a *Tranſubſtantiation*, or a miraculous change of the *Bread* and *Wine*, into the body and blood of *Chriſt*, ſuch a miracle would be to no purpoſe; becauſe, as *Chriſt* himſelf tells them (that thought he would have given them his very fleſh to eat) *the Fleſh profiteth nothing:* his meaning

is,

to be *Canonical.* I confeſs that it is ſo, and that it is written with great Wiſedom and Eloquence in the general; but withall, I affirm that the Authour of it, (which *Jerome* and others think was *Philo* the *Jew*) being neither *Solomon* nor any other of thoſe immediately inſpired Writers, might be and evidently was miſtaken in this which he writes of *Manna*, which it ſeems was one of the *Jewiſh Traditions* in his time, but ſuch a *Tradition* (as many other of their Traditions were) directly contrary to the truth of the *Hiſtory* of the undoubted divine Text of *Moſes*; and therefore (if there were no other) this one Argument is enough to prove this Book of *Wiſedom* not to be *Canonical*, or not to be written by the ſame Spirit that dictated the Books of *Moſes.*

Again, As to the *apparition of Angels* with bodies like *Men*; I anſwer that either they were indeed true and ſolid *Bodies*, and then the Eye was not deceived in judging them to be bodies, neither was he that ſaw them obliged to believe them to be other than they appeared to be, till by ſomething they ſaid or did, he were convinced they were *Angels* with aſſumed Bodies; or elſe they were but *Appearances* onely of true Bodies, which I rather believe, becauſe *Chriſt* ſpeaking of *Spirits*

r its in general, *Luke* 24. 39. ſaith *a Spirit hath not fleſh and bones*; and then though they could not have diſcerned them from *Men* by one of their Senſes (*viz.*) their ſight, yet they might have diſcerned them by another of their Senſes (*viz.*) their touch, or feeling: otherwiſe (as I ſaid before) the κριτήριον or means to diſcern betwixt a *body* and a *ſpirit*, which *Chriſt* himſelf aſſigned, muſt needs be falſe or inſufficient. But ſuppoſing *Tranſubſtantiation*, not onely *one* but *all* the *Senſes* of all mankind muſt be deceived, and deceived always in an object of Senſe; which is incredible.

(3*dly*) There is no ſuch Miracle as *Tranſubſtantiation*, becauſe God never works any *miracle*, but for ſome great and good *End*, and ſuch a one, as cannot be obtained without ſuch a miracle, according to the old and true ſaying, both in Philoſophy and Divinity, *Deus nihil agit fruſtra*, God doth nothing in vain. But ſuppoſing a *Tranſubſtantiation*, or a miraculous change of the *Bread* and *Wine*, into the body and blood of *Chriſt*, ſuch a miracle would be to no purpoſe; becauſe, as *Chriſt* himſelf tells them (that thought he would have given them his very fleſh to eat) *the Fleſh profiteth nothing:* his meaning is,

is, that the eating of his *Fleſh*, or the very ſubſtance of his fleſh in that groſs and *carnal* manner, as they then, and the *Papiſts* now, think it is to be eaten, would doe no man any good at all. For it is not the taking of *Chriſt's body* into our mouths, in the very fleſh or corporeal ſubſtance of it (if it could be ſo taken) that can nouriſh us ſpiritually, or that can nouriſh our Souls into everlaſting life; for then all that receive this *Sacrament* ſhould be ſaved; which yet they do not, nor dare not affirm: but it is the *Spirit*, ſaith *Chriſt*, that *quickneth*, that is, it is the ſpiritual eating of his Fleſh and drinking of his bloud, that nouriſheth us in the life of *grace* here, and will bring us unto the life of *glory* hereafter; and according to this manner of eating and drinking, it is, that *Chriſt* ſaith, *John* 6. 54. that "*Whoſoever eateth his fleſh and drinketh* "*his bloud, hath eternal life*; and in order to the eating and drinking of *Chriſt's fleſh*, and *Chriſt's bloud* in this ſpiritual manner, and to that ſpiritual end, there neither is nor can be any need or uſe of *Tranſubſtantiation*; and conſequently being of no Neceſſity, nor of no Uſe, there can be no ſuch *Miracle.*

(4thly) And laſtly, There can be no ſuch miracle as *Tranſubſtantiation*, becauſe all *Miracles*

racles are poſſible; but *Tranſubſtantiation* is impoſſible as implying many real and formal *Contradictions:* as the being of *Accidents* without *Subjects*, the nouriſhing of *Subſtances* by *Accidents*, and the generation of other *Subſtances* out of the corruption of *Accidents*; as likewiſe, that there ſhould be a *Body* without *quantity*, or *quantity* without *Extention*, or *Extention* without extending it ſelf in any ſpace or place; Or laſtly, that one and the ſame *Body* ſhould be in *divers places* at one time, and yet not fill any place, nor be in any of the ſpaces betwixt thoſe places, and conſequently to be united and not united, divided and not divided; nay, that the ſame body which is in Heaven *circumſcriptivè* or *tanquam in loco propriè dicto* ſhould be at the ſame time out of that place, and conſequently *in loco* and *extra locum*, that is, circumſcribed and not circumſcribed, or circumſcribed in one place and not circumſcribed in another: Beſides many other the like Inconſiſtencies and Contradictions, which you may ſee demonſtrated at large in Dr. *Whitaker*, Biſhop *Morton* and Mr. *Chillingworth*. Now that whatſoever implyes a *Contradiction* cannot be done, no not by *miracle*, is *their* doctrine, as well as *ours*; becauſe, this would rather argue an impotency than an omnipotency in God.

To conclude all, Whereas the *Authour* of this *Pamphlet* ſaith that all *Catholicks*, he means *Romaniſts*, hold that *Chriſt's body* and *bloud* have a *ſpiritual preſence* in the *Sacrament*; and that (ſaith he) being once granted, there can be no difficulty in believing that our Saviour's body and bloud may be in many places at the ſame time, becauſe it is granted to all *Spirits.*

I anſwer, ſuppoſing it were true (as it is not) that all *Romaniſts* held *Chriſt's body* to have a *Spiritual preſence* in the *Sacrament*, and ſuppoſing it were true likewiſe, that a true humane body (as *Chriſt's* is) could have a *ſpiritual preſence*, that is, (as I ſuppoſe his meaning to be) could be preſent as *Spirits* are preſent without filling the place, or ſpace wherein they are; which is moſt falſe. For a *Body* cannot be a body and no body, as it muſt be if it were a *Spirit*; and nothing can have the preſence or propriety of a *Spirit* but a Spirit: and conſequently nothing can be any where as a *Spirit* but a Spirit. But ſuppoſing (I ſay) it were true, that *Chriſt's body* were in the *Sacrament* in a *Spiritual* manner, or after the manner of *Spirits*, yet would it not follow that *Chriſt's body* could be in divers places at the ſame time. For no *created Spirit* can be in many, or in more places than one at the ſame

ſame time, no more than a Body can. Indeed there is a difference between the preſence of a *Spirit*, and the preſence of a *Body*, the former being where it is, *definitivè*, and the other *circumſcriptivè*; But that which is *definitivè*, where it is, cannot be any where elſe than where it is at one and the ſame time, no more than that which is *circumſcriptivè*; and conſequently, to be in many places at once, is as inconſiſtent with the nature of a *Spirit*, I mean of a finite and created Spirit, as it is with the nature of a *Body*. For the Angel *Gabriel* was not with the Bleſſed *Virgin* at the ſame time that he was in Heaven, nor in Heaven at the ſame time, that he was with the Bleſſed *Virgin*; and it was one of the Arguments whereby the ancient *Fathers* prove the *holy Ghoſt* to be *God*, becauſe he may be, and is, in many Places at the ſame time, which no *Spirit* can be but He onely.

There is therefore no ſuch *Miracle* as *Tranſubſtantiation*, it being not onely an Uſeleſs thing if it were ſo, but an Impoſſible thing that it ſhould be ſo.

FINIS.

Ad Cl. Virum

Janum Ulitium

EPISTOLÆ DUÆ

A

Reverendo Viro D. *Georgio Morley* S. T. P. dum *Bredæ* in exilio ageret, conſcriptæ.

QUIBUS,

Vindiciarum ritu, fusè probatur neque D. *Auguſtinum*, neque eorum *Patrum* quenquam, qui ante eum floruerunt, *INVOCATIONEM SANCTORUM*, vel quoad *Doctrinam*, vel quoad *Praxin*, ullatenus probâſſe.

UNIVERSITY LIBRARY CAMBRIDGE

LONDINI,

Impenſis *Joannæ Brome*. 1683.

Ad Cl. Virum

Janum Ulitium

EPISTOLÆ DUÆ

JANO ULITIO

VIRO ERUDITISSIMO

Salutem.



Vir Eruditiſſime,

Auguſtinum tuum *Colonienſem* cum meo *Baſilienſi* diligenter contuli, & locum illum, quem mihi oſtenderas inſpiciendum, pro *Invocatione Sanctorum* in *Meditationum Auguſtini* (ut inſcribitur) libello, eundem planè in utraque editione eſſe invenio. Adeò ut, ſi iſte *Meditationum* liber ſit genuinus & indubitatus *Auguſtini* fœtus, diffiteri non poſſim, quin in hoc ſaltem dogmate magnus ille Eccleſiæ Doctor omninò ſit Pontificius. Sed primò *Eraſmus* (in præfatiuncula iſti *Meditationum* libro præfixa) dicit ſe nec aſſeverare poſſe nec inficiari velle *Auguſtinum* illius libri authorem eſſe, ſed in medio relinquit. Idem faciunt *Colonienſes* in ipſorum *Auguſtini* Editione; nec non ipſe *Bellarminus*, qui in libro ſuo *De ſcriptoribus Eccleſiaſticis*, poſtquàm enumeraſſet omnes & ſingulos libros in Tomo nono Operum *Auguſtini* (in quorum numero & *Meditationes* & *Soliloquia* recenſentur) addit *tres Obſervatiunculas*: quarum *Prima* eſt ex tot *Tomi noni* libris (ſunt autem ultra 40.) ſeptem tantummodò, viz. *Expoſitionem Evangelii & Epiſt. S. Johannis*, *De diſciplina Chriſtiana*, *De decem Chordis*, *De utilitate Pœnitentiæ*, *De Paſtoribus & Ovibus*, & *De convenientia decem Præceptorum & decem Plagarum*, eſſe indubitatos: *quoniam hi*, inquit, *omnes ſunt in indiculo Poſſidii*; Intelligit autem

tem *Indicem* illum, quem *Poſſidius Auguſtini* diſcipulus omnium, quæ à Magiſtro ſuo de re qualibet ſcripta fuerant, fecit & edidit. *Secunda* Obſervatio eſt, Quatuor ejuſdem *Tomi* libros, viz. *De Speculo*, *De conflictu Virtutum & Vitiorum*, *De Explanatione Apocalypſeos*, & *De Antichriſto* eſſe manifeſtò ſuppoſititios. *De reliquis autem hujus Tomi libris* (quæ eſt *Tertia* ejus obſervatio) *nihil*, inquit, *certi habemus: Nam nec poſſumus*, inquit, *certò aſtruere eos eſſe* Auguſtini, *cùm diligentiſſimus collector* Poſſidius *eos præterierit*, *neque inveniamus à* Beda *citatos*, *qui ex operibus* Auguſtini *Commentaria in Epiſtolas B.* Pauli *confecit*; *neque tamen audemus pleroſque eorum librorum negare eſſe* Auguſtini, *cùm pii ſint & docti*, & Auguſtini *ingenio non indigni*. Hæc *Bellarminus*. Undè & ex prædictis ſatis conſtat totum hunc *Meditationum* librum, & proinde locum illum pro *Invocatione Sanctorum* ex hoc libro citatum, dubiæ ſaltem authoritatis vel ab ipſis Pontificiorum primariis haberi: & ex Præmiſſis dubiis non infertur certa Concluſio. Quare ex hoc libro, quem non conſtat eſſe *Auguſtini*, non poteſt conſtare *Auguſtinum* vel Sanctos invocâſſe, vel illorum invocationem probâſſe.

Quin inſuper, ut mihi videtur, ex illis *Bellarmini* obſervationibus non modò non conſtat *Auguſtinum* hujus libri authorem fuiſſe, ſed conſtat illum ejus authorem non fuiſſe. Nam ſi *Poſſidius* diligentiſſimus fuerit Operum Magiſtri ſui Collector (quod fatetur *Bellarminus*) & tamen hujus libri nullam omninò mentionem fecerit, certè pluſquàm veriſimile eſt nullum hujuſmodi librum ſcripſiſſe *Auguſtinum*. Neque alicujus momenti eſt, quod *Bellarminus* addit in contrarium; nempè negare ſe non audere hunc & cæteros hujus claſſis libros (quatuor tantum exceptis) à *Poſſidio* præteritos, *Auguſtini* eſſe, quoniam *pii*, & *docti*, & *Auguſtini ingenio digni* ſunt (quod tamen non eſt uſque adeò verum, ut negari non poſſit.) Nam quantumvis *docti* & *pii* ſint iſti libri, poſſunt tamen non eſſe *Auguſtini*, niſi concedamus neminem poſſe doctè & piè ſcribere præter unum *Auguſtinum*; quod non credo *Bellarminum* ipſum, qui multa etiam & doctè & piè ſcripſit, eſſe conceſſurum.

Præterea

Prætereà ſunt quædam in iſto *Meditationum* libro, quæ non poſſunt eſſe *Auguſtini*: Nempe *Hymnus* iſte in Cap. 26. numeris metricis & rhythmicis compoſitus, quod genus carminis *Auguſtini* ſæculo ignotum fuit, utpote à *Scholaſticis* poſt *Auguſtinum* multis annorum centenis excogitatum; ut ex *Sexti Senenſis* Biblioth. l. 3. colligi poteſt. *Nam cùm Scholaſtici*, inquit ille, *deſiderarent homines ſui ſæculi rhythmis deditos ad ſtudia ſacrarum literarum allicere, arreptâ hinc occaſione excogitaverunt & ipſi novam metricæ artis rationem, quæ ab omnibus eruditis contemnebatur, & prorſus explodebatur, tanquam inepta, ſuperſtitioſa, & riſu digna.* Jam verò ſi hoc rhythmicum metri genus *Scholaſticorum* inventum fuerit, quàm abſurdum ſit hujuſmodi Hymnum *Auguſtino* affingere (inter quem & *Lombardum* omnium *Scholaſticorum Magiſtrum* ſex ad minimum ſæcula intercellerunt) nemo meliùs judicare poteſt, quàm tu (ΨLIII) qui es *Chronologiæ* peritiſſimus; & prætereà (ut cum *Catullo* tuo loquar)

Tantò maximus omnium Poeta,
Quantò ego minimus omnium Theologus.

Quam * ἀτοπίαν & σφάλμα *Chronologicum* animadvertentes *Colonienſes*, qui libellum tuum ediderunt, iſtius *Hymni* conſcriptionem non *Auguſtino* ſed *Petro Damiano* Cardinali aſſignant. Sed nihil tale, quo diſtinguitur Author hujus *Hymni* ab authore totius *Libri*, reperitur in Editione *Frobeniana*; & certè ſi tunc temporis aliquid hujuſmodi innotuiſſet, nec *Eraſmi* diligentiam & perſpicacitatem latere, nec ab illo veritatis & *Auguſtini* amantiſſimo diſſimulari potuiſſet. Quare veriſimilius eſt eundem & *Hymni* & totius *Libri* Authorem fuiſſe; qui multa ex *Auguſtino* conſarcinavit, quibus & multa de ſuo addidit, & inter alia illas Sanctos invocandi formulas: Quæ cùm nullum habeant in S. Scriptura fundamentum, nec in praxi veteris & nondum corruptæ Eccleſiæ exemplum, ille, quiſquis fuerit illarum *Meditationum* conſarcinator, ut ſuperſtitioſo ſui temporis genio inſerviret, *Auguſtini* nomine & autho-

* *abſurditatem & lapſum.*

authoritate abutebatur. Quod idem ab ejus ſimilibus factum eſt in aliis aliorum *Patrum* operibus interpolandis, ad eundem & alios poſteriorum temporum errores confirmandos & commendandos.

Interea tamen non inficias eo, quin in ipſo *Auguſtini* ſæculo hujus ſuperſtitionis ſemina & ſparſa fuerint & pullulare cœperint: Sed nego *Auguſtinum* ipſum in hoc errore fuiſſe; aut tales *Invocandi ſanctos* formulas in *Auguſtini* temporis Eccleſia communiter receptas vel publicè uſurpatas fuiſſe.

Denique cum *Melanchthone* doctiſſimo & modeſtiſſimo Theologo audacter dico, perverſum hunc & pravum *Sanctos invocandi* morem (quantumvis poſteà cum Dei & Sanctorum contumelia in Eccleſia invaluerit) in tribus prioribus poſt *Chriſtum* ſæculis, non modò inuſitatum, ſed aut inauditum aut damnatum fuiſſe: nec poſſe ullum certum & indubitatum teſtimonium ex ullis *Patrum*, qui ante quartum ſæculum vixerunt, monimentis in contrarium proferri. Tuum tibi libellum remitto, & te valere jubeo,

Tui obſervantiſſimus

& amiciſſimus

Ex Collegio Auriaco
Bredæ, Apr. 24.
1659.

Geor. Morley.

Eruditiſſimo Clariſſimóque Viro

JANO VLITIO, S. P.

MUltùm vereor (*Eruditiſſime VLITI*) nè me malæ fidei debitorem eſſe credas, quòd tam diu in ære tuo ſum: ſed uterque noſtrûm (ut noſti) per totum ferè hujus temporis intervallum domo abfuimus, & ego non ſum *Bias*, ut omnia mea mecum portare poſſim, neque Bibliotheca ἐμψυχος; & hujuſmodi debitum non poteſt (ſaltem à me & tenuitate mea) niſi per otium, nec abſque librorum adjumento diſſolvi.

Sed jam ut quod poſſum præſtem; Cùm duæ ſint *Epiſtolæ* tuæ partes, quarum altera diſquiſitionis eſt *Theologicæ*, altera verò *Hiſtoricæ*; Ego à poſteriore incipiam, utpote levioris momenti argumento, & in quo me vinci vel à quolibet erudito, multò autem magis ab eruditiſſimo *Vlitio* facilè patiar. Verum eſt itaque quod dicis, cùm tu & ego unà obambularemus, & neſcio quâ occaſione de fabuloſa illa veterum *Britannorum* origine, à *Bruto*, *Æneæ* pronepote vel abnepote derivatâ, fieret mentio, me dixiſſe Nonnihil ad fidem iſti fabulæ adſtruendam facere, quòd *Britanni* eundem cum *Trojanis* & cæteris *Aſiaticis* in curribus pugnandi morem haberent, ab aliis *Europæ* gentibus (quantum quidem ego meminiſſe poteram) non uſurpatum. Obiter etiam & aliud adjeci (cujus tu non meminiſti) nempè (quicquid de Inſulanorum noſtrorum *Origine* ſtatueretur,) pluſquam veriſimile eſſe illos rudimenta *Chriſtianæ* religionis ab *Aſiaticis* primùm accepiſſe. Quoniam *Auguſtinus* Monachus à *Gregorio* primo ad prædicandum Evangelium *Saxonibus* miſſus, veteres illos Inſulæ incolas jam *Chriſtianos*, & orientalis conſuetudinis in celebrando *Paſchate* obſervantiſſimos

De BRITANNORUM *Origine.*

mos invenit, nec ad contrariam *Eccleſiæ Romanæ* praxin ullis vel minis vel pollicitationibus perſuadere potuit. Et hoc quidem mihi videtur eſſe *apodicticum* argumentum nos primam in fide Chriſtiana Inſtitutionem non *Romanis* (ut illi jactitant,& inde jus & juriſdictionem *Romanæ Eccleſiæ* in nos vendicant) ſed *Apoſtolorum* aut Apoſtolicorum virorum alicui debere; qui ſtatim aut non diu poſt *Aſcenſionem* Domini huc appulit, & unà cum Catholica fide, ritus, in illis unde venerat locis uſurpatos, hic docuit.

Sed prius illud quod attinet, de *Origine* ſcilicet *Britannicæ Gentis*, à *Bruto* nimirum neſcio quo, adeóque ab *Æneâ* & *Trojanis* deducendâ, Nemo eſt noſtrûm vel exterorum, qui tam inſulſæ fabulæ minùs credit quàm ego; quod etiam & tunc dixi. Neque illum *Britannis* communem cum *Trojanis*, ignotum verò cæteris *Europæ* gentibus, pugnandi morem adduxi, ut inde fictam iſtam *Genealogiam* ſeu originationem gentis noſtræ confirmarem; ſed tantùm ut, quid ab ejus aſſertoribus cum aliqua veriſimilitudinis ſpecie dici poſſit, indicarem. Ego enim libenter tecum agnoſco credibile eſſe omnes *Inſulas* ex proxima *Continenti* primos ſuos incolas habuiſſe; & proinde etiam *Britannos* à *Belgis* vel à *Gallorum Germanorúm*ve aliquibus eſſe oriundos.

Agnoſco inſuper (quod & tunc etiam te ſuggerente protinùs agnovi) alios, præter *Britannos*, *Europæos*, nempè *Græcos* veteres, teſte *Homero*, *Italóſque* antiquos, teſte *Virgilio*, eodem genere armorum uſos fuiſſe; quod quamvis in illo temporis articulo non ſatis animadverterem, non potui tamen omninò ignorare, utpote qui in neutro illorum nobiliſſimorum Poetarum adeò ſum peregrinus, quin illa omnia, quæ tunc & nunc ex ambobus protuliſti, ſatis noverim. Quare & nullam omninò in illo argumento à me allato vim eſſe facilè concederem, ſi nullo alio, præterquam Poetarum, teſtimonio niteretur; vel ſi Poetarum teſtimonium per ſe ſolum ad hiſtoricam rei geſtæ fidem faciendam ſatis eſſet.

Sed primò non ſunt *Poetæ*, ſed *Hiſtorici*, qui ſunt temporum, & morum, & rerum geſtarum teſtes; quoniam

---- *Picto-*

——————Pictoribus atque Poetis
Quidlibet audendi ſemper fuit æqua poteſtas,

ut inter Poetas unus ex clariſſimis non fatetur modo, ſed gloriatur. Jam verò apud *Poetas* ſolos extat, ex *Europæis Græcos* & *Latinos* veteres illum *Aſiaticum* pugnandi ex curribus morem uſurpâſſe: ſed ex indubitatæ fidei *Hiſtoricis* conſtat tam *Britanniæ* quàm *Aſiæ* incolas hunc in modum præliari ſolitos.

Præterea illa quæ ex *Homero* de veteribus *Græcis*, & ex *Virgilio* de veteribus *Latinis* à te proferuntur, ad illam temporis periodum pertinent, quam μυθικὸν ſeu fabuloſam appellat doctiſſimus Romanorum *Varro*. Nam *Troja* juxta *Chronologos* à *Græcis* eſt expugnata circa Annum Mundi ſecundum poſt bis milleſimum, hoc eſt, annis octo & quadringentis ante *primam Olympiadem*, à qua incipit illud temporis interſtitium, quod ab eodem *Varrone* dicitur ἱςορικὸν, quia res in eo geſtæ veris hiſtoriis continentur. Adeò ut quæcunque à quibuſvis (exceptis ſacri Codicis) Scriptoribus vel de antediluvianis vel poſtdiluvianis rebus ante *primam Olympiadem* traduntur, vel *ἄδηλα ſint vel †μυθικὰ; & proinde nihil certi aut veri ex illis colligi aut concludi poteſt. Nam, ut noſti, ex Præmiſſis dubiis & incertis Concluſio certa & indubia non ſequitur.

* *incerta*, † *fabuloſa.*

Quare pace tuâ dixerim illa omnia quæ ex *Homero* & *Virgilio* affers, cùm ſint ex talibus deſumpta qui hiſtoricam fidem non profitentur, & ad illam mundi ætatem pertineant, de qua nobis nihil certi conſtare poteſt, non ſufficere ad oſtendendum illum *Aſiaticum* pugnandi morem vel *Græcis* vel *Latinis* cum *Britannis* fuiſſe communem; quia quod de *Britannis* diximus ſolidiori nititur fundamento, *hiſtorico* ſcilicet hiſtoricorum temporum teſtimonio.

Sed quare inquies, vel *Homerus* Græcos, vel *Virgilius* Latinos fingeret alio quàm tunc temporis ſolebant more cum hoſtibus confligere & curribus potiùs quàm equis vectos in hoſtem ferri? Reſpondeo fortaſſe hoc ab *Homero* factum eſſe, quia grandius & magnificentius & *Heroïcis* viris, quorum facta refert, dignius videbatur ſublimes in Curru, tan-

quam in Solio ſedentes, quàm equo ſolitario tanquam gregarios milites inſidentes, pugnare: vel quia illis ipſis temporibus, quibus *Homerus* hæc ſcripſit, *Aſiatici* hujuſmodi curribus in bello utebantur, & noluit *Græcos* ſuos armis & militaribus inter bellandum ornamentis ab illis ſuperari, de quibus in exitu belli erant victoriam reportaturi. *Virgilius* autem eadem de ejuſdem ætatis *Heroibus* prædicat, quia *Homeri* ſimilis & ſequax per omnia eſſe voluit. Quòd ſi *Homericis* temporibus currus militares apud *Græcos* homines in uſu fuiſſent, mirum profectò eſt neminem hiſtoricorum Græcorum illud memoriæ prodidiſſe; cùm *Homerus* (teſte *Suidâ* & *Porphyrio*, & magno veſtro *Voſſio* è *Suidâ*) ante primam *Olympiadem*, (1.) ante *mythicorum* temporum Epocham, & *hiſtoricorum* initium annis non pluribus quàm centum & triginta vixerit; & ut talium curruum, intra tam exigui temporis compendium, non uſus modò obſoleſceret, ſed memoria, quòd unquam in uſu fuerant, prorsùs interiret, vix ac nè vix quidem credi poteſt.

Quare verum eſt, quod tu dicis, *Cæſarem* cum admiratione quadam obſervâſſe illam apud *Britannos* ex eſſedis pugnandi rationem; idque non ſolùm (ut tibi videtur) ob pugnandi agilitatem, & diſcurrendi deſultandique promptitudinem (quamvis & eo etiam nomine mirabilior res eſſet) ſed ob rei ipſius novitatem, qualem anteà nuſquam viderat, & quam nec à tam rudi cæterorum omnium gente inventam eſſe potuit credere, nec quando, nec quomodò vel ab *Aſia*, vel à *Græcia*, vel ab *Italia* tam multis retrò ſæculis, & per tam longa locorum intervalla traducta fuerit, potuit conjectare. Ex illo autem (quod quaſi per * ἐπανόρθωσιν quandam adjicis) cauſam admirationis in *Cæſare* eſſe poſſe, quòd veterem illum præliandi morem, jam in *Latio* & alibi deſitum & antiquatum, ibi adhuc ſupereſſe videret, conſequens eſt illum præliandi morem in *Britannia* fuiſſe antequam in *Latio* deſierat eſſe, quia aliàs non rectè dicitur antiquato illi in *Latio* ſupereſſe. In *Latio* autem ſi unquam fuerit, ante Urbem *Romam* conditam eſſe deſiit, quia *Livius*, qui ab urbe condita hiſtoriam

* *tui ipſius correctionem.*

hiſtoriam ſcripſit, nullam hujuſmodi conſuetudinis mentionem fecit. Quod ſi in *Britannia* fuerit ante Urbem conditam, quare non ab aliquo *Trojanorum*, quibuſcum in *Italiam* venire poterat, etiam in *Britanniam* veniſſe crederetur?

Nam militarem Eſſedorum uſum *Britannos* à *Belgis* didiciſſe (quicquid *Virgilius*, aut *Servius*, aut *Strabo*, ea de re dixerint) non facilè crederem. Primò quia Eſſeda *Belgica*, de quibus *Virgilius* loquitur, & quæ à *Belgis* inventa *Servius* dicit, videntur fuiſſe vehicula ruſtica & non militaria, ideoque à *Virgilio* non in *Polemicis* ſed in *Georgicis*, ſuo ſcilicet in loco, tractata. *Virgil. Georg.* 3.

Deinde *Strabonem* quod attinet, quamvis ſit teſtis fide dignus, in illis præſertim locis & locorum incolis deſcribendis quos ipſe adierat & viderat (vidit autem quamplurima tum locorum, tum gentium) potuit tamen hallucinari, & alios in errorem invitus ſecum ducere, cùm illa refert, quæ fando tantùm audiverat, cujus generis, ut fatetur ipſe, non pauca ſcripſit. Et hujuſmodi ſphalma videtur eſſe teſtimonium illud, quod ex illo profers, ut doceas non modò *Britannos*, ſed quoſdam ex *Celtis* (quos tu *Belgas* interpretaris, quamvis *Cæſar* Gallos *Celtas* à Gallis *Belgis* apertè diſtinguat) eſſeda ad militares etiam uſus accommodâſſe. Nam hunc *Celtarum* vel *Belgarum* pugnandi morem (ſi talis uſpiam apud *Gallos* tunc temporis fuiſſet) certè *Caius Cæſar* (qui univerſam *Galliam* non tantùm oculis luſtravit, ſed bellando & debellando peragravit) neſcire non potuit, nec reticere voluit; multò minùs eandem pugnandi rationem, quam priùs in *Gallia* viderat, poſtea in *Britannia* viſam, tanquam rem novam mirari, & pluribus verbis tam accuratè deſcribere, ut aliis etiam innoteſceret, tam diligentem & methodicum rerum à ſe geſtarum ſcriptorem decuit. Quare aut nullus Eſſedorum militarium uſus apud *Celtas* erat, aut poſt *Cæſarem*, in illo ſcilicet temporis intervallo, quod inter Bellum *Gallicum* & *Strabonem* (cùm hæc ſcriberet) interceſſerat, primùm uſurpatus. Unde conſtat *Britannos* hunc Eſſedorum uſum non potuiſſe à *Belgis* vel à *Celtis* diſcere.

Strabo (ipſe Voſſio) *ſcripſit circa initium Principatus* Tiberii Cæſaris.

cere. *Celtas* verò, cum *Cæſari* in bello *Britannico* operam darent, veriſimilius eſt, qualem ibi vidiſſent bellandi artem, à *Britannis* didiciſſe & poſtea in patria ſua uſos eſſe. Quod ipſe etiam *Strabo* innuere videtur, cùm primùm de *Britannis* & *Britannorum* plurimis, deinde verò de *Celtis* & *Celtarum* quibuſdam tantummodo, hoc affirmet: Omnis autem conſuetudo ibi videtur diutiùs obtinuiſſe ubi à pluribus & peritioribus, quàm ubi à paucioribus & imperitioribus uſurpatur.

Quod etiam tu pro tuo acumine (acutiſſime *Vliti*) præſenſiſſe & præcaviſſe videris, cùm ex *Tacito* conaris oſtendere non univerſos *Britannos* ex Eſſedis præliari ſolitos, ſed quaſdam ſolummodo in *Britannia* nationes, illas ſcilicet ultra *Taum* fluvium & *Grampium* montem Boreales: ſed quantumvis hoc verum fuerit, cùm *Tacitus* vitam *Agricolæ* ſoceri ſui ſcriberet; certè verum non fuit cùm *Caius Cæſar* in *Britanniam* appulit. Nam ille in *Cantio*, quàm longiſſimè à *Tao* flumine & *Grampio* monte, militem ſuum primò expoſuit, & ibi tamen Covinarios illos Bellatores invenit; & quamvis non longè ultrà *Tameſin* flumen progreſſus fuerit, ſæpiùs cum eodem more pugnantibus conflixit: nec dubium eſt quin à *Tameſi* uſque ad *Taum*, imò quaquaversùm vel in longitudinem vel in latitudinem diffuſa eſt Inſula, eadem fuerit tunc temporis apud Inſulanos pugnandi ratio. Quare nè *Tacitum* cum *Cæſare* committas, ſed ut utrique, qua dignus eſt, ſua conſtet fides, meminiſſe te oportet (mi *Vliti*) quod in proximè antecedenti periodo ipſe monuiſti, *Britanniam* ſcilicet poſtquam tam diu (à *Julio* ſcilicet ad *Domitianum* Cæſarem) *Romanam* militiam experta atque imitata fuiſſet, ſuam paulatim dedidiciſſe; idque in illis partibus Inſulæ priùs & maturiùs, quæ erant Caſtris & Præſidiis *Romanorum* magis vicinæ & obnoxiæ; donec tandem *Romanis* omnia ubique per univerſam Inſulam occupantibus, & victis morum ſuorum imitationem unà cum veſtigalibus imperantibus, antiquus Covinorum in Bello uſus (ut tu rectè admones) omninò deſiit & interiit.

Et ſic (doctiſſimè *Vliti*) habes meam (qualemcunque) ad

ad primam eruditiſſimæ *Epiſtolæ* tuæ partem reſponſionem, ſeu potiùs Apologiam (non dicam pro veritate, ſed) pro veriſimilitudine illius argumenti, quod ad falſam fateor *Hypotheſin* ſuffulciendam, non ſeriò, ſed diſputandi tantùm gratiâ inter obambulandum in medium protuli. Ideoque etiam ea, quæ nunc adjeci, ſcias eodem animo à me ſcripta; nullo nimirum à te diſſentiendi ſtudio (nam de *Britannorum* origine prorsùs idem tecum ſentio) ſed more tantùm Dialectico ſeu Academico, quo quid de quaque re in utramque partem probabiliter dici poſſit, nec injucundum nec omninò inutile eſt aliquando experiri. Quod tamen cave quæſo nè factum à me putes, ut de Eruditionis laude in re *Critica* & *Hiſtorica*, aut in aliquo alio politioris literaturæ genere tecum contenderem: Sed nè omninò inſulſus, & ab humanioribus ſtudiis prorsùs alienus, eoque nomine amicitiâ tuâ indignus eſſe videar.

Sed jam tempus eſt ut ad *ſecundam* Epiſtolæ tuæ partem me accingam; quæ cùm ad fidem & Religionem pertineat, diſquiſitionem magìs ſeriam & magìs diligentem meretur. Quamvis perſuaſiſſimum habeam te non magìs *Invocationem Sanctorum*, quàm me illam de *Bruto* fabulam, ex animo probare.

De Oratione pro Mortuis.

Primùm itaque diſtinguere oportet illa quæ tu videris confundere, *Invocationem* intelligo *Sanctorum* (de qua ſola erat inter nos quæſtio) & *Invocationem Dei pro defunctis*; de qua antea nec à te quæſitum, nec à me dictum quidquam fuit. Nam non eſt idem nec ejuſdem conſiderationis *Defunctos orare*, & *orare pro Defunctis*: ſed duo ſunt, & duo quamvis non *contraria*, adeò ut unum alterum tollat, tamen tam *diverſa*, ut nullam omninò connexionem neceſſariam inter ſe habeant: adeò ut conceſſo *Orationem pro Defunctis* in aliquo ſenſu eſſe licitam & antiquam, non ſequatur tamen *Invocationem Sanctorum* vel non eſſe novam, vel non impiam. Et reverà multò magìs antiqua & multò minùs reprehendenda eſt *Oratio pro Defunctis*, quàm *Sanctorum Invocatio*.

Orationem autem *pro Defunctis* non talem intelligo, qualis

nunc eſt in uſu apud *Pontificios*, nec tali innixam fundamento, ingenioſo ſcilicet & quæſtuoſo *Purgatorii* Commento. Nam ex veteris Eccleſiæ conſuetudine (*Orandi pro Defunctis*) probari non poteſt (quamvis illud falsò ſupponant & gratìs aſſumant *Pontificii*) Veteres illos credidiſſe mortuos, pro quibus orabant, in tali, qualem illi ſomniant, loco cruciatos eſſe, aut ex illo loco & cruciatu vivorum ſuffragiis liberari poſſe. Nam primus Veterum apud quem conſuetudo *Oblationum* & *Orationum* pro mortuis reperitur, eſt *Tertullianus:* ſed is de *Purgatorio Pontificio*, aut de tertio aliquo loco ſive receptaculo animarum à corpore ſeparatarum nunquam cogitavit: Nam libro quarto *contra Marcionem*, & *de Anima*, duo tantum loca excipiendis animabus corpore exutis conſtituit, ubi quaſi ſequeſtrentur in diem Judicii, *Inferos* ſcilicet pro Reprobis; pro animabus verò Juſtorum *ſinum Abrahæ:* quem dicit eſſe regionem non cœleſtem, ſublimiorem tamen Inferis, interim præbiturum refrigerium animabus Juſtorum, *donec Conſummatio rerum reſurrectionem omnium plenitudine mercedis* (ut ille loquitur) *expungat*; hoc eſt, beatitudinis humanæ ſummam conficiat; tractâ locutione à more ſupputantium, qui ſemel atque iterum diſpuncto Calculo, ubi minores omnes ſummas in unam contraxerint, reliqua omnia ſolent expungere.

Sed ad quid (inquies) igitur, aut cui bono erat illa vetuſtiſſima offerendi & orandi pro defunctis in Eccleſia conſuetudo? aut quales erant hujuſmodi *oblationes* & *orationes?* Reſpondeo ex uſu priſcæ Eccleſiæ per *oblationes pro mortuis* non intelligi *oblationes* ἱλαστικὰς (1.) *propitiatorias* ſeu *expiatorias* (nam tales oportebat non à *Laicis*, nedum à feminis, ſed à ſolis *Sacerdotibus* offerri) ſed *eleemoſynarias*; Nam *Tertullianus* in lib. *De Monogamia* dicit *Uxorem offerre pro Marito annuis diebus dormitionis ejus:* itémque in lib. *de exhortatione Caſtitatis*, dicit *Maritum annuas reddere Oblationes pro Uxore*; quorum neutrum fieri potuit, ſi alteruter obtuliſſet *Oblationes* ἱλαστικὰς. Fuerunt itaque † ἀντιμισικαὶ, nempe *eleemoſynæ* in uſum pauperum erogatæ, quas

* *propitiatorias.*
† *gratitudinem ſignificantes.*

quas Apoſtolus ad ‖ *Hebræos*, vocat *Sacrificia*, & talia ſacrificia, quibus * δ᾽αρεσκεῖται ὁ Θεὸς. & ſportulas quidem, quæ in uſum pauperum conferebantur, vocari & intelligi illas in priſca Eccleſia *Oblationes* manifeſtiſſimum eſt ex *Carthaginienſi* Concil. 4. Can. 85. *Qui oblationes defunctorum* (1.) pro defunctis, *aut negant Eccleſiis, aut difficulter reddunt, tanquam Gentium necatores, Excommunicentur.* Adeò ut *offerre pro Mortuis* ſecundum mentem veteris Eccleſiæ nihil aliud fuerit, quàm *eleemoſynis* in pauperes gratum erga Deum animum profiteri pro ſolutione piarum animarum ex ergaſtulo corporis & pro illarum ex ærumnoſo & periculoſo hujus vitæ ſtatu liberatione, & ad requiem ſeu *refrigerium* (ut *Tertullianus* vocat) manuductione.

‖ Heb. 13. 6.

* *delectatur deus.*

Quòd ſi piorum animæ ſtatim poſt exitum de corpore ſint *in refrigerio*, quid opus eſt, inquies, *orationibus* illas proſequi? quaſi *orationes* etiam non poſſint aut non ſoleant eſſe δ᾽χαριστικαί? & tales certè erant, quibus ad Altare *Patriarchæ*, *Prophetæ*, *Apoſtoli* & *Martyres* commemorabantur, de quorum felici ſtatu dubitari non potuit, & *pro quibus*, ut inquit † *Auguſtinus*, *injuria eſt orare* (1.) alio modo quàm * δ᾽χαριστικῶς. Non nego tamen præter δ᾽χαριστικὰς fuiſſe apud veteres *in Officio Mortuorum* orationes etiam ‖ δ᾽κλιτικὰς, quibus aliquid pro defunctis optari aut peti videtur, quaſi adhuc illis deſit. Nam *Tertullianus* de hujuſmodi orationibus loquens, dicit *pios animabus ſuorum optare refrigerium:* ſed illæ animæ ſecundum eundem *Tertullianum* aut jam erant, aut nunquam futuræ erant *in refrigerio*, cùm *ex Inferno nulla* ſit *redemptio*, nec pœnarum in Inferno mitigatio; & præter *Infernum* & *ſinum Abrahæ* nullum tertium animabus ſeparatis receptaculum agnoſcit *Tertullianus*. Reſtat igitur ut dicamus veteres ſenſiſſe, poſſe aliquid piè & non ineptè à Deo peti, quod jam conceſſum à Deo crederent. Ea enim eſt infirmitatis humanæ præſertim in rebus fidei ratio;

* *gratitudinis causâ oblata.*

† *Serm. 17. de verb. Apoſt.*

* *gratulando, ſeu gratias agendo.*

‖ *precatorias.*

ut

ut de illis quæ valdè volumus, nunquam ſatis, ſaltem nunquam ~~nimis~~ certi & ſecuri, dum in hac vita ſumus, eſſe poſſimus. Et hinc profectæ ſunt illæ tam frequentes & tam vehementes *Davidis*, *Danielis*, & aliorum *Sanctorum* hominum in S. literis ad Deum *orationes*, ut promiſſis ſuis ſtaret, ut illud, quod in ſe ſuſceperat præſtandum, adimpleret, & ſimilia, quæ omnia certo certius futura eſſe non dubitabant.

Sed hæc, inquies, quantumvis certa, nec præſentia erant nec præterita, ſed futura; alia autem eſt ratio *futuri* & *præteriti*; nam illud optare ut fiat, quod jam factum eſſe ſcimus, non ſolum * ἄτοπον ſed planè † ἀδύνατον videtur eſſe: & eſt quidem, ſi certò ſcimus illud factum eſſe, quod Deum precamur ut fiat. Sed aliud eſt *ſcire*, aliud *credere*. Nam ubi eſt *ſcientia*, ibi eſt certitudo, & certitudo abſque omni dubitatione tam ex parte *ſubjecti*, quàm ex parte *objecti*: Sed ubi eſt *fides* tantùm, ibi quamvis ſit infallibilis certitudo *objecti*, non eſt tamen indubitabilis certitudo *ſubjecti*, aut talis certitudo perſuaſionis in credente, quin votis & precibus ſit adhuc locus, ſecundum illud Evangelii, * *Credo Domine, ſuccurre incredulitati meæ.*

* *abſurdum.*
† *impoſſibile.*

* *Marc.* 9. 24.

Quare qui optimè novit infirmitatem noſtram, docuit nos peccatorum omnium noſtrorum veniam quotidiè petere, quotieſcunque anteà pœnitentiam egerimus; adeò ut ex ipſius *Chriſti* inſtituto edocti ſimus, orare ut aliquid, quaſi denuò, fiat, quod jam factum eſt: nam *pœnitentibus* & *credentibus* jam ſunt dimiſſa omnia ſua *debita*, & tamen quantumvis pœnitentibus & credentibus orandum eſt quotidiè ut debita ſua dimittantur, & quidem omnia & non illa tantummodò quæ quotidiè contrahuntur. Jam ſi orare liceat pro remiſſione peccatorum noſtrorum quæ jam ſunt remiſſa, quare etiam & aliis benè precari non licebit, quibus jam bene eſt? aut quibus credimus, etiam ante Orationem noſtram pro illis, bene eſſe?

Certè ille (quem tu per * τὴν δεῖνα ſignificas) pro matre ſua *Monica* hoc fecit; eo nimirum (quem dixi) animo oravit pro ſalute ejus, quam jam

* *quendam.*

jam ſalvam eſſe credidit; ut conſtat ex illo ipſo loco à te allegato; ubi revera orat pro matre defuncta, ut dominus dimitteret ipſi ejus debita. Sed adverte quæſo, quod ſtatim diſertis verbis ſubjungit; *& credo*, inquit, *quòd jam feceris, quod te rogo, ſed voluntaria oris mei approba:* id eſt, permittas me ex abundantia filialis meæ in optimam matrem affectûs ſic loqui. Ubi etiam advertendum eſt, quòd particula Copulativa *ET* non eſt otioſa, ſed vim habet valde emphaticam; nam ita ſonat, ac ſi dixiſſet, Oro quidem quaſi pro re nondum facta & tamen credo factam eſſe; nam non poſſum non credere illam, quæ ſic vixit, jam ſalvam eſſe, quia ſic jubent fides & charitas ſpiritualis; non poſſum tamen non orare, etiam adhuc, ut ſalva ſit, quia ſic cogunt infirmitas & impetus naturalis.

Confeſſ. l. 9. cap. penult. & ultimo.

Quòd verò dicit in præcedenti Capite *ſacrificium pretii noſtri pro ea poſt mortem oblatum eſſe*, intelligi non poteſt ac ſi offerretur pro expiatione peccatorum ejus, utpote quæ jam (ut ipſe dicit) credebat expiata; ſed ut inter offerendum memoria ejus fieret inter alios qui *in Domino* (1.) in fide Dominici ſacrificii pro peccatis expiandis, obdormierunt; nam hoc illud erat, quod moriens ipſa deſideraverat, nempe ut adhuc vel mortua pro membro corporis Chriſti haberetur, & una ex illorum numerò eſſe cenſeretur, qui omnes uno eodémque, unico ſcilicet & ſemel oblato corporis & ſanguinis Chriſti ſacrificio à peccatis ad ſalutem, à morte ad vitam æternam redempti ſunt. Nam in hoc ſenſu & ob hanc potiſſimum rationem in adminiſtratione ſacrorum Myſteriorum *Commemoratio defunctorum* fieri ſolebat; nempe ut inde intelligeretur, omnes *Sanctos* tam mortuos quàm vivos ad idem corpus pertinere, nec per ipſam mortem ab unitate Eccleſiæ poſſe ſeparari; & præterea nullum eſſe aut unquam fuiſſe tam ſanctum aut innocentem, quin hujus ſacrificii merito ad expiandam peccatorum noxam, & ad placandum & propitiandum ſibi Deum opus habuerit; ſive *Patriarcha*, ſive *Prophetæ*, ſive *Apoſtolus*, ſive *Martyr*, ſive ipſius *Dei Mater* fuerit; nam omnium horum nomina ad Altare recitabantur,

non quòd tunc poſt mortem, ſed quòd antea dum in vivis eſſent, hujus ſacrificii indigentes erant. Adeò ut ſuppoſitâ hac conſuetudine *pro defunctis orandi & offerendi*, in hoc ſenſu à veteribus uſurpatâ, nihil inde auctoramenti aut argumenti pro hodiernis *Miſſis precibúſque pro mortuis*, in *Pontificiorum* ſenſu celebratis, poſſit colligi. Nam *Pontificii* orant & offerunt pro illis, quos credunt eſſe *in cruciatu*; Veteres autem orabant & offerebant pro illis quos credebant eſſe *in refrigerio*.

Et hoc fieri potuit (ut dixi) vel ex pio affectu illis benè precandi, quibus jam benè eſſe ſperabant; vel ex deſiderio promovendi illos à conditione non malâ ad meliorem. Nam multi ex antiquiſſimis Patribus, ut *Juſtinus Martyr*, *Tertullianus*, *Clemens Romanus*, *Lactantius*, *Victorinus Martyr*, & alii, non putabant animas juſtorum hinc rectà ad cœlos ire; ſed *in ſinu Abrahæ*, vel in aliquo alio refrigerii loco uſque ad ultimi judicii diem detineri; adeóque intereà *Beatificæ viſionis* ſeu perfectæ felicitatis, ex Dei promiſſione & Chriſti merito illis debitæ, expertes eſſe. Quare cùm ſic judicarent, non abs re erat Deum illorum nomine orare, ut maturaret illum diem, quem coronandis *Sanctis* ſuis in plenitudine Redemptionis deſtinâſſet.

Imò & nobis etiam *orare pro defunctis* in aliquo ſenſu non eſt aut illicitum aut inutile: nam quamvis non ſimus in illa Veterum opinione, quòd *Sanctorum animæ* uſque ad finem ſæculi è cœlis excludantur; tamen cùm Anima ſit tantùm pars hominis, & ad felicitatem naturæ humanæ pertineat, ut tota & integra & ex omni ſua parte beata ſit, quod ante Reſurrectionem corporis fieri non poteſt; idcircò, inquam, & nobis licet & noſtro & defunctorum nomine Deum orare (quod etiam, ſecundum ritum ab *Eccleſia Anglicana* in ſepeliendis mortuis præſcriptum, ſolemus facere) precantes "*ut* "*placeat infinitæ Dei bonitati, brevi explere numerum Electo-*"*rum ſuorum & maturare gloriam regni ſui, ut nos unà cum* "*fratre noſtro* tunc ſepulto, *& omnibus aliis vitâ defunctis in* "*vera fide & confeſſione nominis Chriſti, conſequamur perfec-*"*tam abſolutionem & beatitudinem tum corporis tum animæ*

"*in*

" *in perpetua & ſempiterna Dei gloria.* Quam ego precandi formulam unà cum præcedenti *gratiarum actione* (etiam apud nos uſitatâ) *pro liberatione defuncti ex hujus mundi ærumnis*, itémque commonefactione de hujus vitæ brevitate, & miſeriâ, & de futuræ vitæ immortalitate & felicitate ex idoneis S. ſcripturæ locis deſumpta, & coram adſtantibus recitata (quæ omnia habentur in *Rituali Anglicano*) vel eadem eſſe exiſtimo, vel quàm minimè differre ab illa veterum *offerendi & orandi pro defunctis* Conſuetudine ſecundum primitivam & genuinam ſignificationem intellecta; accedentibus præſertim *Eleemoſynis*, quæ in funeribus apud nos communiter fieri ſolent, & Doles in patrio idiomate appellantur.

Sed non diſſimulandum eſt hanc antiquiorem & ſaniorem (quam nos adhuc in Eccleſia noſtra retinemus) *orandi & offerendi* pro defunctis ſeu defunctorum nomine intentionem, paulatim poſt tertium ſæculum immutari cœpiſſe; adeò ut ipſe *Auguſtinus*, cùm in tempora magìs magíſque in ſuperſtitionem vergentia incidiſſet, vulgi ſemper in deterius ruentis impetu aliquantulùm abreptus fuerit; Nam cùm tres faciat ordines *defunctorum*, alios ſcilicet valdè bonos, alios valdè malos, & tertios inter illa duo extrema quaſi medios, animadverterétque unam eandémque eſſe pro omnibus defunctis in Eccleſia orandi formam, orationes illas ad alienum à vetuſtiorum Patrum mente ſenſum ſic inflexit, ut negari non poſſit, quin *Purgatorio Pontificio* anſam præbuerit, dum de *tertio* inter *Beatorum* & *Damnatorum* ſedes *loco* diſputat, quamvis timidè, & hæſitabundè, & problematicè tantùm illud faciat. In uno enim loco dicit *animas defunctorum pietate viventium liberari ex Purgatorio*; alibi verò ſítne *Purgatorium* necne non audet ſtatuere. Nam de *Civit. Dei* lib. 21. c. 26. *forſitan*, inquit, *verum eſt.* Et in *Enchirid.* c. 69. *Tale aliquid poſt hanc vitam eſſe non eſt*, inquit, *incredibile*, & *utrùm ita ſit*, *quæri poteſt.* Ad *Dulcitium* denique eadem repetit, & de hac & huic ſimilibus quæſtionibus, *Hæc deſcripſimus*, inquit, *ut tamen in iis nulla veluti Canonica conſtituatur authoritas.* Unde colligitur vel quòd Hiſtoriam *Maccabæorum*

cabæorum Auguſtinus pro Canonica non habuerit, vel quòd inde ſuam *pro mortuis offerendi* ſententiam non ſatis conſequenter deduxerit, vel quòd ſibi (in hac ſaltem Opinione) non ſatis conſtiterit. Utcunque hoc certum eſt, quòd *Auguſtinus* nihil de *Purgatorio* definivit, multò minùs pro dogmate fidei habuit aut ab aliis haberi voluit; imò cùm Canonicam *Purgatorio* authoritatem diſertis verbis deroget, clarum eſt quòd quicquid de illo ſenſerit, illud tamen de fide eſſe apertè neget; quare *Pontificiæ* de *Purgatorio* ſententiæ adeò non ſuffragatur, ut omnino adverſetur.

De Invocatione Sanctorum. Sed quicquid de *Oratione* aut *Oblatione pro mortuis* ſenſerit ſcripſeritve *Auguſtinus*, vel *Ambroſius*, vel *Epiphanius*, vel *Chryſoſtomus*, (quamvis *Epiphanius* in illa contra *Aërium* diſputatione propiùs ad priores, quàm ad poſteriores Patres accedat) non tamen inde conſequens erit vel *Auguſtinum*, vel ullum ex reliquis *Invocationi Sanctorum* patrocinatum eſſe; nam *Invocatio Sanctorum* cum *Oratione pro mortuis* nihil habet commune; & præterea *hæc* (ut dixi) eſt in aliqua acceptione licita; *illa* verò quomodocunque accipitur, & toto genere eſt illicita: *hæc* inutilis tantùm & ſuperſtitioſa; *illa* verò idololatrica, & in Deum aut Chriſtum aut utrumque contumelioſa. Nam omnis *Invocatio* eſt (ut ipſi *Pontificii* ſolent diſtinguere) vel *ſumma* & *directa* & *abſoluta* & *terminativa*; vel *ſubalterna*, & *indirecta* & *relativa* & *tranſitiva*, ſeu per unum ad alium tranſiens. Et de *Invocatione ſumma*, *directa*, *abſoluta* & *terminata*, ipſi fatentur quod ſit *Latria* ſeu cultus ſoli Deo debitus; & proinde talem *Sanctorum Invocationem* eſſe reverà *Idololatricam*. Invocationem verò *ſubalternam*, *indirectam*, *relativam* & *tranſitivam*, hoc eſt, illam quæ mediantibus *Sanctis*, & ſanctorum meritis *ad Deum* dirigitur & refertur, & *in Deum* ultimatè terminatur, nec *Idololatricam*, nec *ſuperſtitioſam*, nec *illicitam*, ſed utilem, laudabilem, & *Deo Sanctiſque* ejus pergratam eſſe. Jam verò quodcunque nos ex S. *Scripturis*, ex *Conciliis*, vel ex *Patribus* pro ſolius *Dei Invocatione* proferimus, illud de priore tantùm *Invocationis* ſpecie volunt intelligi, ac ſi illa ſoli Deo eſſet debita.

Nos

Nos verò hanc *Invocationis* distinctionem frivolam, nuperam, imò nullam esse dicimus; utpote cujus nullum vel *præceptum*, vel *exemplum* in Scripturis *Veteris* vel *Novi Testamenti*, nec in praxi purioris & antiquioris *Ecclesiæ*, nec in iis ipsis denique *Patribus*, quos à Pontificiis in hac causa allegatos esse dicis, reperitur; sed est purum putum Commentum ad excusandam hodiernam Ἀγγελολατρείαν & Ἁγιολατρείαν excogitatum. Quæ quidem * Ἀγγελολαλεία & Ἁγιολαλεία cum Gentilium † Δαιμονολατρεία eadem res est, aliis nominibus fucata, & ex *Gentilium Philosophia*, in *Ecclesiam Christianam* paulatim introducta, non obstante Apostoli *Pauli* diligentissimâ per totum secundum Caput Epist. ad *Colos.* præmonitione, ut ab illa *Gentilium Philosophia* caverent sibi *Christiani*. Nam ut tu probè nosti (*eruditissime Vliti*) *Gentilium Philosophi* non minùs quàm *Christiani*, unum summum *DEUM*, cui summus & supremus Cultus debebatur, & quem * Δημιεργὸν appellabant, agnoscebant. Sed inter illum unicum *summum Deum* & homines, alios medios quosdam *Divos* aut *Deos minorum gentium* esse credebant, quos communi nomine *Daimonas*, specialiùs verò *Penates*, *Lares* & *Deos* particularium vel gentium, vel urbium, vel hominum *Tutelares*, indigitabant. Horum autem *Dæmonum* alios dicebant nunquam fuisse corpori alligatos (& hoc est illud genus quod nos appellamus *Angelos*) Alios verò *Heroum*, hoc est præstantissimorum, & de humano genere dum viverent optimè meritorum virorum Animas à corpore separatas, quales apud nos *Sancti*, & in *Ecclesia Romana* non *Sancti* modò, sed etiam gentili suo nomine *Divi* nuncupantur. Hos autem ex utroque genere Δαίμονας, dicebant esse, ut naturâ medios, sic officio *Mediatores* inter summum Deum & homines, quibus scilicet mediantibus & procurantibus, homines Deum iratum placabant, & à Deo placato, omnia, quæ ipsis ad * εὐδαιμονίαν necessaria erant, impetrabant. Et eo nomine hos Δαίμονας non quidem ut summum Deum, sed tanquam humani

* *Cultus Angelorum & Sanctorum.*

† *Cultus Heroum & Dæmonum.*

* *Conditorem Creatorem seu Opificem universalem.*

* *felicitatem.*

humani generis apud ſummum Deum procuratores, advocatos, & *Patronos*, ab hominibus colendos eſſe exiſtimabant: Cultúſque illis hoc nomine exhibitus, erat illorum *Invocatio*, in *Imaginibus* veneratio, *Templorum* & *Altarium* dedicatio, *Votorum* in morbis & periculis nuncupatio, *Tabularum votivarum* & *Donariorum* poſt defuncta pericula in delubris illorum ſuſpenſio, denique ad loca quæ illis ſacra & maximè chara eſſe exiſtimabantur, *Peregrinatio*.

Et vide quæſo (*mi Vliti*) an non hæc omnia eodem nomine, in honorem (ut dicitur) *Angelorum* & *Sanctorum*, ſed reverà in contumeliam *Dei* & *Chriſti*, à Chriſtianis (eodem ſtratagemate deceptis) nunc fiant? nam ut Veterator ille ſub ſpecie majoris reverentiæ erga ſummum Deum, *Philoſophis* (Gentilium Theologis) olim imponebat; ſuggerendo illis, temerarium & audax eſſe facinus, ſi quis mortalium ad tam ſublimem & tremendam Majeſtatem immediatè accederet, ideóque non niſi per tales quos ille ipſis tum ſuggerebat *Mediatores*, Δαίμονας ſcilicet, ad ſummum Deum appropinquandum; illíſque *Dæmonibus* quicquid boni homines à Deo acceperint, aut accepturos ſe ſperarent, imputandum eſſe. Unde *ſenſim ſine ſenſu* omnes ubique gentium Mortales vetus ille *Serpens* non ſolùm à cultu ſed à cognitione *ſummi Dei* facilè abſtraxit; & ad cultum *Dæmoniorum*, hoc eſt, ſui (ſub Dæmoniorum nomine) tandem pertraxit. Nam ita naturâ comparatum eſt, ut non *à quo*, ſed *per quem* beneficium accepimus, aut putamus nos accepiſſe, illum potiſſimum & amemus & colamus. Sed hoc erat *Opus Tenebrarum* in Tenebris. Poſtquàm verò Oriente *ſole Juſtitiæ* noſtræ, hæ *Dæmoniorum* umbræ evaneſcerent, & *ſummus* ille *Deus* veriùs cognoſci & ſanctiùs coli, quàm unquam anteà, à quamplurimis mortalium cœpiſſet, ſolo & unico inter ipſum & homines *Mediatore*, *Chriſto* nimirum, qui & *Deus* eſt & *Homo*, patefacto; tunc veterator ille, depoſito ad tempus *Serpente*, *Leonem* induit, & ab aſtu ad rabiem converſus, quos reſtare *Dæmoniorum* Cultores viderat, ad ferro & flammâ perſequendos veros unius *Dei* & unius *Mediatoris* ſervos concitabat, ut nè omninò eſſent, qui ejus ampliùs

ampliùs esse nollent. Sed cùm progressu temporis hoc illi ex animo non succederet, sed *sanguinem Martyrum Ecclesiæ semen* esse videret; ad artes veteres & veteratorias iterum conversus est. Et cùm ad *Reliquias Martyrum*, & *Orationes* fieri & *Oratoria* extrui, & nonnunquam *Miracula* etiam à Deo edi in talibus locis animadverteret, ex illo ipso *Martyrum* sanguine, quod semen *Ecclesiæ* fuerat, sibi & *Synagogæ* suæ, quam in ipsa Dei *Ecclesia* habiturum se sperabat, sementem facere cogitavit. Quare ut incautâ simplicitate piorum animorum faciliùs abuteretur, effecit primùm ut *Orationes ad Memorias Martyrum* factæ, gratiores Deo esse crederentur, quàm si alibi ubiam factæ essent: deindè cùm aliquid magni, & ultra spem in talibus locis precantium, impetrabatur, effecit etiam ille *Hostis Humani generis*, ut illud non totum *Deo*, sed aliquam partem *Martyri*, vel saltem *Martyris* apud Deum gratiæ & meritis imputaretur. Et ut hujusmodi persuasionem animis hominum altiùs infigeret, vel *falsis* miraculis ibidem à se confictis, vel etiam *veris* à Deo sed in alium finem editis, ab illo verò aliorsum detortis, hanc ad superstitionem humanæ naturæ propensionem adeò fovit & auxit, ut qui initio *ad Martyrum Memorias* Deum solum invocare solebant, ad ipsos tandem *Martyres* orationes suas dirigerent, utpote sine quorum auxilio & suffragio nihil à Deo impetrandum crederent. Jam quia omnes *Confessores* sunt in voto *Martyres*, & omnes verè *Sancti* sunt vel actu vel voto *Confessores*, adeóque omnium Defunctorum, quos ex judicio Ecclesiæ constat esse *Sanctos*, eadem est ratio, *Angelorum* autem ratio longè potior; idcirco tum *Angelorum*, tum *Sanctorum* omnium *Invocatio* tandem obtinuit, & in consuetudinem abiit. Et sic Antiqua *Gentilium* utriusque generis δαιμονολατρεία sub aliis (*Angelorum* nempe & *Sanctorum*) nominibus, sub eodem verò Humilitatis prætextu est restituta, & à *Christianis* recepta, seu potiùs ab *Antichristo* Christianis obtrusa.

Eóque magis * ἀναπολογητικῶς, quia *Gentiles*, cùm *summum Deum* absque *Mediatore* adire meritò non auderent, & nullum inter *Deum* & ipsos *Mediatorem* à Deo constitutum haberent, talibus, quales ipsi sibi

* *inexcusabiliter.*

suâ

ſuâ ratiocinatione fingere potuerunt, Mediatoribus uſi ſunt. Sed *Chriſtiani*, cùm talem ſibi à Deo datum *Mediatorem* habeant, qui omnia apud Deum *poteſt*, utpote *Dei filius*; & quicquid poteſt *vult* à Deo pro hominibus impetrare, utpote *filius hominis*; & præterea *ad dextram Dei ſedet*, ut *Advocatum* noſtrum apud Patrem ſuum agat; juſſitque nos omnes ad ipſum accedere, & quicquid *ipſius nomine* à Patre petituri ſumus promiſit datum iri; cùm talem, inquam, *Chriſtiani* habeant inter Deum & illos ab ipſo Deo conſtitutum *Mediatorem*, ſtultum profectò eſſet (ſi liceret) *alium* ſubſtituere, quia nemo apud Deum efficacior, nemo erga homines benevolentior. Sed cùm *Chriſtus* non ſolùm optimus ſed unicus inter Deum & homines ſit μεσίτης (ſecundum illud *Pauli*, Εἷς θεὸς, εἷς καὶ μεσίτης θεῶ καὶ ἀνθρώπων, ἄνθρωπος Ἰησοῦς Χριστὸς) de *alio* præter illum cogitare non eſt *ſtultum* modò ſed *impium*. Nam *alium* præter illum velle, eſt illum nolle; imò eſt *Chriſtum* de ſolio ejus, quantum in ipſis eſt, deturbare, & alium, qui non eſt Deus, *ad dextram Dei*, hoc eſt, in ſummo divinæ Majeſtatis faſtigio collocare; quod (ut anteà dixi) non modò eſt *ſtultum* & temerarium, ſed planè *impium* & Idololatricum. Quare hujuſmodi Chriſtianorum *Angelolatria* & *Hagiolatria* multò minùs excuſatior eſt, quàm Gentilium *Daimonolatria*.

* 1 *Tim.* 2. 5. *Unus Deus unus Mediator inter deum & homines Homo Jeſus Chriſtus.*

Nam quòd unicum reverà *Mediatorem Redemptionis*, plures vero *Interceſſionis* eſſe dicant, præterquàm quòd iterum diſtinguant, ubi ſcriptura non diſtinguit, falſum eſt plures eſſe vel eſſe poſſe inter Deum & homines *Mediatores Interceſſionis*. *Intercedere* enim (ut tu, qui es juriſconſultiſſimus, optimè noſti) eſt verbum forenſe, & ſignificat non ſimpliciter orare, aut poſtulare, aut flagitare, ſed pro ſuo jure & poteſtate apud alium agere, & quò minùs aliquid fiat, ſe & authoritatem ſuam interponere. Et hoc quidem modo *Chriſtus* intercedit pro nobis apud Patrem ſuum, non vociferando aut clamando, ſed ſemetipſum & ſua merita inter patris ſui juſtitiam, & fratrum ſuorum peccata interponendo; & nè ſeverè

severè & stricto jure cum illis agat, quasi pro suo jure prohibendo & impediendo. Adeò ut ille, qui fuit *Mediator Redemptionis*, idem & præter eundem nemo sit aut possit esse *Mediator Intercessionis*. Et hinc est, quod *Paulus* disertè dicit, *Quoniam Christus humiliavit se ad mortem Crucis* dum Mediatorem ageret Redemptionis, *ideo exaltatum esse ut sederet ad dextram Dei*, & ibi ageret Mediatorem Intercessionis; adeò ut *posterius* sit *prioris* quasi fructus & præmium, & eâ ratione Christo * θεανθρώπῳ debitum, ut nulli Creaturarum sine maximo *sacrilegio* & manifestissimâ *idololatriâ* communicari aut debeat aut possit.

* *qui Deus est & Homo.*

Quòd si respondeant se *Angelorum* & *Sanctorum* Intercessione non apud Deum *vice Christi*, sed apud *Christum* suâ ipsorum vice uti: Primùm quid opus est alio *Intercessore* apud Intercessorem, illóque minùs efficaci & benevolo, apud magis efficacem & benevolum? deinde falsum est quod dicunt; Nam istis Intercessoribus utuntur apud Deum vel *vice Christi*, vel *simul cum Christo*; imò orant Sanctos ut eodem modo, quo *Christus* intercedit, & illi apud Deum intercedant, *hoc est*, per merita sua, aut per meritorum suorum repræsentationem & interpositionem, quorum intuitu Deus etiam peccatorum veniam ipsis largiatur: ut manifestum est ex publicis apud illos precandi formulis; imò secundùm communem in *Ecclesia Romana* praxin sæpiùs & libentiùs aliquem *Angelorum* vel *Sanctorum*, vel *beatam Virginem*, quàm *Christum* invocare solent, ut apud Deum pro ipsis intercedant: quamvis neminem ex *Angelis* vel *Sanctis* cum fide invocare possint, quin illum *Angelum* vel *Sanctum*, * καρδιογνώστην (quod solius Dei in Scripturis est attributum) esse agnoscant; & præterea in illum tanquam in Deum credant. Nam (ut inquit Apostolus) *quomodo illum invocabunt, in quem non crediderunt?* ad quem locum Apostoli acutissimus Pontificiorum Cardinalis *Peronius* nihil habet quod reponat, præter talem de *Fide*, qualem antea de *Invocatione* euderat, distinctionem: *Nam dici, potest*, inquit, *quòd nos credimus in*

* *Cordis scrutatorem.*

Rom. 10. 14.

Replique a la Reſp. du Roy de la grande Bret. pag. 1047.

in Sanctos in aliquo ſenſu, & ſecundum aliquam analogiam & proportionem; adeò ut non *Invocationem* modò ſed & *Fidem* fingat *ſummam* & *ſubalternam*, *directam* & *indirectam*, *abſolutam* & *relativam*, *terminatam* denique & *tranſitivam*: quæ certè audax eſt & inaudita, & tam *Patribus* quàm *Scripturis* ignota conſideratio & diſtinctio. Nam ſecundum *Peronium* ſic diſtinguentem, licet non modò *credere hominibus*, ſed *credere in homines*: Credere autem *in aliquem* eſt omninò & abſolutè ab illo pendere, in illum recumbere, & omnem ſpem & fiduciam noſtram in illo collocare, & proinde illum pro Deo habere. Nam in nullo alio ſenſu Avarus à Sancto *Paulo* dicitur * εἰδωλολάτρης quàm quia credit in ſuum *Mammona*. Quare etiam Invocatores *Angelorum* & *Sanctorum*, cùm fatente *Peronio* non poſſint illos invocare, niſi etiam in illos credant, pro *Idololatris* à nobis meritò habentur. Nam

Eandem habet diſtinctionem Bellar. *de Sanct. Beat. lib.* 1. *c.* 20.

* *Cultor idoli.*

——*Nobis non licet eſſe tam diſertis*
Qui Deum colimus ſeveriorem,

ut cum illo ludere, aut potiùs illi illudere talibus diſtinctiunculârum nugis audeamus.

Sed quid faceret *Peronius*? videbat illum locum *Pauli* tam apertè tam * ἀποδεικτικῶς, & tam ἀνελέγκτως pro ſolius *Dei Invocatione* facere, dum negat poſſe eſſe in ullo ſenſu objectum *Invocationis*, quod non ſit objectum *Fidei*, ut nullâ patente rimulâ, quâ elabi poſſit, viam ſibi vi fecerit. Nam Argumentum Apoſtoli concedens, nempè (illum ſolum à nobis eſſe *invocandum*, in quem nobis eſt *credendum*) *Aſſumptionem* in illo argumento implicitam, nempè (*Sed in ſolum Deum nobis eſt credendum*) audacter negat, affirmans non credendum eſſe in *Deum* ſolum, ſed etiam in *Angelos*, & in *Sanctos*; adeò ut Apoſtolo & Spiritui Sancto in Apoſtolo loquenti maluerit contradicere, quàm ſpiritui Mendaciorum in

* *Demonſtrativè & irrefragabiliter.*

in *Eccleſia Pontificia* Blaſphemias eructanti, non aſſentir[1] vel potiùs aſſentari; nam ut poſteà patebit, non tam ſui-ipſius, quam *Eccleſiæ* ſuæ ſententia fuit, quam hic defendit. Et certè talis ac tantus vir fuit, tam ſublimi pariter ac ſubtili ingenio, & omnibus eruditionis adjumentis adeò inſtructus, ut illud *Virgilianum* de *Hectore*, mutatis mutandis, de *Peronio* prædicari poſſit (quod jam antea à nobiliſſimo, eruditiſſimo & acutiſſimo, mihíque amiciſſimo viro *Falklandio* obſervatum fuit)

——— Si Pergama dextrâ
Defendi poſſent, etiam hâc defenſa fuiſſent.

Et tamen omnia, quæ ab illo & aliis *Romanæ Eccleſiæ* Advocatis in hac cauſa, pro *Invocatione* ſcilicet *ſanctorum*, dicta ſunt, ipſi volunt ſic intelligi, ut pro *Invocatione* tantùm *ſubalterna*, *indirecta*, *relativa* & *tranſeunti* valere exiſtimentur; tali nimirum Invocatione, quâ aliquid per ipſos à Deo petitur, & non quâ aliquid ab ipſis concedendum nobis, aut pro nobis faciendum rogatur. Nam talis fatente *Peronio*, ſi ad creaturam dirigatur, Invocatio eſt *Idololatria*. Sed talis eſt, inquam ego, *Invocatio Sanctorum* in *Eccleſia Romana*; ídque non modò in praxi vulgari, ſed in præſcriptis ab Eccleſia precandi formulis publicè & communiter uſitatis; ut cuilibet *Breviarium Romanum*, *Horarium*, & *Pſalterium Virginis*, & *Litanias Sanctorum* inſpicienti facilè conſtabit. Sed nolo ſtercorarium illud commovere; unicam tantùm ad *Beatam Virginem* precatiunculam exſcribam, &

---Crimine ab uno (ut *Virgilius* tuus loquitur) *Diſce omnes---*

O Maria *gratioſa*,
Dulcis, miti & formoſa,
Applica nobis Gratiam.

O Maria *glorioſa,*
In deliciis delicioſa,
PRÆPARA nobis Gloriam.

REPARATRIX & SALVATRIX
Deſperantis animæ,
Irroratrix & LARGITRIX
Spiritualis gratiæ;

Quod requiro, quod reſpiro,
Mea SANA vulnera,
Et DA menti te poſcenti
Gratiarum munera.

En precandi formulam (ſi unquam fuerit aut eſſe poſſit) *directam*, *abſolutam*, & ad *Virginem* ipſam determinatam. Et hìc *Sanctos* orandi modus, in *Eccleſia Romana* uſitatus & probatus, nè omnibus non innoteſcat, non modò eſt in libris deſcriptus, ſed in Templorum foribus depictus, & in publicarum Ædium parietibus exaratus; ut *Bruxellis*, ubi in fronte Ædium urbis publicarum proſtat majuſculis literis deſcripta, ita ut ab omnibus tranſeuntibus legi poſſit, hæc Incolarum ad *MARIAM*, tanquam ad urbis *TUTELAREM DEAM* ſupplicatio;

A BELLO, PESTE & FAME, LIBERA NOS *MARIA.*

Quæ cùm ſit communis apud illos *Beatam Virginem* & alios *Sanctos* invocandi formula, certè aut nulla unquam fuit, aut hæc eſt *Idololatria*; & talis Idololatria qualem nec *Peronius* ipſe audet defendere, nec ullo ex Patribus teſtimonio conatur aſſerere. Quare dato, non conceſſo, quod illa altera, *indirecta* ſcilicet & *relativa* (quam vocant) *Sanctos* invocandi ſpecies in priſca & primitiva Eccleſia obtinuiſſet, inde tamen

tamen nihil poteſt confici, aut ad defendendam aut ad excuſandam hodiernam *Romanæ Eccleſiæ* praxin. Sed neque vel hæc aut ulla omninò erat præterquàm *ſolius Dei* in priſca Eccleſia *Invocatio:* neque hanc Pontificiorum in *directam* & *indirectam*, *abſolutam* & *relativam*, & in *ſummam* & *ſubalternam* (ut *Peronius* loquitur) *Invocationis* diſtinctionem veteres agnoverunt: Sed de *Invocatione* ſemper uno eodémque modo ſimpliciter loquentes, illam, ut proprium & incommunicabilem Dei cultum, ſoli Deo nunquam non aſcribunt. Et hinc eſt quòd *Athanaſius* & cæteri ex veteribus *Orthodoxi* contra *Arianos* diſputantes, ex eo quòd invocaretur *Chriſtus*, concludunt illum eſſe *Deum*, cujus argumenti vim *Ariani* facillimè retudiſſent reſpondendo poſſe aliquem, qui non ſit *Deus*, invocari (*Invocatione* ſcilicet *ſubalternâ*, *indirectâ* & *relativâ*, quamvis non *ſummâ*, *directâ* & *abſolutâ*) ſi talis *Invocationis* diſtinctio tunc innotuiſſet.

Prætereà in illis *dogmaticis* & *didacticis* veterum Scriptis, quæ *Tertullianus*, *Cyprianus*, *Nyſſenus*, *Auguſtinus*, & alii de *Invocatione* ex inſtituto & eo fine, ut alios docerent quomodò orandum eſſet, ſcripſerunt, nulla eſt hujuſmodi diſtinctio, nec ulla omninò de *Invocatione* aliqua *Sanctorum* vel leviſſima indicatio; ut fatetur *Peronius* pag. 1042. Et tamen ex talibus potiſſimum ſcriptis dicit idem *Peronius*, quænam ſit veterum Patrum de re qualibet germana & genuina ſententia eſt judicandum. *Pag.* 1043. Denique ſi hanc ſubalternam & relativam *Sanctorum Invocationem* Patres agnoviſſent & probâſſent, cùm *Celſus Origeni*, *Julianus Cyrillo*, & *Fauſtus Manichæus Auguſtino* objicerent eundem eſſe cultum quem *Gentiles Heroibus*, & *Chriſtiani Martyribus* exhiberent, non ſimpliciter illud, quod objiciebatur, negâſſent; ſed dixiſſent aliam eſſe Sanctorum *Martyrum*, quam Gentilium *Heroum* rationem, & quamvis fas ſit *illos*, nefas tamen eſſe *iſtos* vel ſubalternâ prece invocare; nam ſummum cultum non niſi ſummo Deo *Gentiles* ipſi deferendum eſſe cenſuerunt; quare ſi ſubalternum cultum per ſubalternam *Invocationem* Chriſtiani *Martyribus* ſuis exhibuiſſent, certè eodem prorſùs modo & illi *Martyres*, & Gentiles *Heroas* ſuos coluiſſent. Hîc

Hîc autem operæ pretium eſt animadvertere, qualem huic nodo cuneum applicuerit *Peronius*; *PATRES* pag. 1044. *enim*, inquit, *non ſemper loquuntur quod ſentiunt, ſed diſſimulant, & illud dicunt quod cauſæ quam ſuſtinent maximè inſervit, ut illam contra Gentilium objectiones tueantur.* Et paulò poſt, *Patres*, inquit, *quantum in ipſis eſt, & quàm maximè poſſunt, fugiunt & declinant omnes de Sanctorum Invocatione, quæ tunc erat in Eccleſia, loquendi occaſiones; metuentes ſcilicet nè Gentilibus quædam quaſi conformitas (quamvis falſa & æquivoca) eſſe videretur, inter cultum ab Eccleſia Sanctis, & à Paganis, falſis ſuis numinibus exhibitum; & nè Pagani inde anſam arriperent (quamvis non juſtam) retorquendi in ipſos* (Patres ſcilicet) *illam Eccleſiæ* (nempè Sanctos invocandi) *conſuetudinem.* Sed annon hæc eſt confeſſio ſatìs aperta, nullum in veterum *Patrum* ſcriptis ſatìs idoneum pro tali Eccleſiæ conſuetudine extare teſtimonium? & cùm hoc ita ſit, unde quæſo aut nobis aut ipſi *Peronio* conſtare poteſt talem tunc temporis fuiſſe in Eccleſia conſuetudinem? an aliud, præterquàm ex veterum ſcriptis, quid ſenſerit aut fecerit *vetus Eccleſia*, poteſt eſſe indicium? Deinde an non hinc conſtat, quòd Pontificii (quicquid in contrarium jactitant) minùs honorificè quàm nos de *Patribus* & de veteri Eccleſia ſentiunt? Nam quis noſtrûm unquam dixit aut ſcripſit, *Patres*, ut ſuæ cauſæ ſervirent, vel diſſimulâſſe quæ ſcirent eſſe vera, vel pro veris aſſeruiſſe quæ magìs profutura vel minùs obfutura ſuæ cauſæ eſſe crederent? aut quis noſtrûm de *Eccleſia Chriſti*, vel de *fide Chriſtiana* tam abjectè ſenſit, ut ullam illius praxin, vel hujus partem metu *Paganorum*, aut nè Religio noſtra nobis apud Gentiles probro aut opprobrio eſſe poſſet, celandam aut diſſimulandam eſſe credidit? Abſit ut nos ſic pudeat Evangelii, cujus nec *Paulum* puduit, nec ullos unquam *Orthodoxorum Patrum*; qui ſi metuiſſent ſibi vel doctrinæ Chriſtianæ à Gentilibus, nè malè ſcilicet apud illos audiret Evangelium, certè non minùs ſuam in *Sanctam Trinitatem* fidem, nè ejuſdem cum Gentilibus πολυθεΐας*, quàm *Invocationem Sanctorum*, nè ejuſdem cum illis

* *plurium deorum cultus.*

illis * Δαιμονολατρείας insimularentur, dissimulâssent. Quare cùm *alteram* semper & apertè, pro data occasione, profiteantur, *alteram* verò nunquam; imò cùm de *altera* passim glorientur, *alteram* verò, quotiescunque illis objiciebatur, clarè & constanter negent; oportet *Peronium* nimis cæco in Matrem suam *Ecclesiam Rom.* affectu abreptum fuisse, cùm, nè ejus turpitudinem non tegeret, talem antiquis *Patribus* & *Catholicæ Ecclesiæ* infamiæ notam inurere non erubuerit.

* *Dæmonum seu Heroum cultus.*

Et profectò, ut mihi videtur, sic se gessit in hac causa *Peronius*, ut veterem Ecclesiam Gentilibus similem, quàm *Romanam* veteris Ecclesiæ dissimilem, credi maluerit. Nam negari non potest quin in *Ecclesia Rom.* talis sit nunc *Angelorum* & *Sanctorum*, qualis olim apud Gentiles *Heroum* & *Dæmonum* suorum cultus fuit. Quod etiam aliquando futurum esse *Paulus* & prævidit & prædixit; cùm 1. ad *Tim.* c. 4. disertè dicat, *In posterioribus temporibus* has * Δαιμονίων διδασκαλίας (1.) de δαιμονολατρείᾳ doctrinas in Christianam Ecclesiam, unà cum Matrimonii & Ciborum prohibitione, subrepturas. Et certè (ut constat ex temporum serie ab eruditissimo Theologo, *Josepho Meado* nostro diligentissimè observatâ) hæc tria *Sanctorum Invocatio*, *Cœlibatus sacerdotalis* institutio, & *Ciborum* quorundam *prohibitio* ab iisdem authoribus (*Monachis* scilicet ad Episcopatum provectis) & eodem ferè tempore (nempè circa medium aut versus finem quarti sæculi & deinceps) in Ecclesiam publicè introduci cœperunt. Nam (ut inquit *Chemnitius in Exam. Con. Trid.* p. 632.) circa annum Dom. 370. per *Basilium*, *Nyssenum* & *Nazianzenum* in publicos Ecclesiæ conventus (occasione Orationum Panegyricarum) *Invocatio Sanctorum* invehi cœpit; quamvis nostrorum alii dicant, ut & ipse *Chemnitius* posteà dicit, illos non tam invexisse quàm occasionem illam invehendi dedisse aliis; qui ex illorum Panegyricorum *Apostrophis*, *Prosopopœis*, & ejusmodi aliis *Rhetoricis* & figuratis locutionibus ansam arripuerunt, eadem * δογματικῶς & seriò docendi

* *Doctrinas Dæmonum seu doctrinas de Dæmonibus.*

* *doctrinaliter.*

Quamvis,

Quamvis illi ipſi Panegyrici (*Nazianzenum* & cæteros intelligo) quoties rhetoricando licentiùs evagantur, * ἐπανορθώσεις quaſdam plerunque ſubjiciant, nè ab auditoribus, ſecùs quàm oporteret, intelligerentur. Qualia ſunt illa *Nazianzeni* (de *Sanctorum* pro nobis *Interceſſione* diſſerentis) † ὡς οἶμαι, ὡς πείθομαι, εἰ μὴ τολμηρὸν τοῦτο εἰπεῖν, εἴ τις αἴσθησις, & ſimilia. Jam qui ſic loquuntur, conſtat illos ipſos nullam illarum rerum, de quibus tam cautè & timidè pronunciant, habere πληροφορίαν, aut plenam perſuaſionem. Et tamen ex illis tam parvis initiis, tam levibus & incertis fundamentis, totus ille tam ſplendidus, tam pompoſus, & ſuprà Gentilem theatricus (quem nunc videmus inter Chriſtianos) *Angelorum*, *Sanctorum* & *Imaginum* Cultus eſt extructus: poſteriori bus nimirùm ſæculis ſuperſtitioni priorum aliquid inſuper de ſuo ſemper adjicientibus; donec iiſdem veſtigiis inſiſtendo tandem ad famoſam illam *Apoſtaſiam* deventum eſt, quam Apoſtolus 2. ad *Theſſ.* c. 2. prædixit aliquando futuram eſſe in Eccleſia Chriſtiana; Apoſtaſiam dico *in Eccleſia*, non *ab Eccleſia*; quia Apoſtolus (ut conſtat ex illo ad *Theſſ.* loco cum illo ad *Tim.* Epiſt. 1. cap. 4. comparato) per illam *Apoſtaſiam* non intelligit apertam & abſolutam Chriſti, aut fidei Chriſti abnegationem, ſed ſub falſa humilitatis & devotionis ſpecie ſubdolam à vero unius *Dei* & unius *Mediatoris* cultu defectionem; dum honor ſoli ſummo *Deo* & *Chriſto* ejus debitus ad *Dæmonas* & *Heroas* Chriſtianos (1.) ad *Angelos* & *Sanctos* vel transfertur, vel ſaltem cum illis communicatur. Et hæc eſt illa *ſpiritualis fornicatio*, per quam Meretrix *Babylonica* in Scripturis potiſſimum indigitatur: Nam quantumvis agnoſcat *Chriſtum* pro Marito, cùm aliis tamen ſe proſtituat, eſt *Mœcha*: imò quantumvis ſe proſtitueret aliis, ſi non agnoſceret *Chriſtum* pro Marito, non eſſet Mœcha: Nam *Mœcha* non eſt, niſi ſit & *Uxor* & *Meretrix*, aut talis Meretrix quæ Maritum habet: & ob hanc eandem cauſam Prophetæ veterem Eccleſiam *Iſraelis* toties & tam graviter

* *correctiones ſeu interpretationes retractatorias.*

† *ut puto, ut perſuaſum habeo; ſi temerarium non ſit ità loqui, ſi quis ſenſus ſit, ſi defuncti audiant & intelligant quæ de illis vel ad illos à vivis dicuntur.*

viter accuſant *Adulterii*; non quòd verum Deum omninò non colerent, ſed quòd alios præter illum, aut unà cum illo colebant.

Neque alicujus momenti eſt quod à quibuſdam reſponderi ſolet, *Judæos* ſcilicet & *Gentes* aliis præterquàm Deo *ſacrificâſſe*, ſe verò *Sanctos* & *Angelos* tantùm *invocare*; & *ſacrificium* reverà eſſe cultum ſoli Deo debitum, ſed non *invocationem*. Nam primùm hæc reſponſio eſt *principii petitio*, cùm ſumat pro conceſſo quod adhuc eſt probandum, nempè *Invocationem* & præſertim talem Invocationem, qualis apud illos erga *Sanctos* ſuos in uſu eſt, non eſſe cultum ſoli Deo debitum. Deinde *Judæi* & *Gentiles*, quibus *ſacrificabant*, eoſdem & illos ſolos *invocabant*; ideóque non minùs indebitè *invocando*, quàm indebitè *ſacrificando* peccabant. Denique cùm omnia proprie dicta *Sacrificia* in illo unico, ſemel oblato, ſemper commemorando, & nunquam repetendo *Crucis ſacrificio* ſuam conſummationem, & proinde finem etiam & abolitionem habuerint, nulla nunc ſub Novo Fœdere niſi *ſpiritualia ſacrificia* ſunt à *Chriſtianis* offerenda; cujus generis imprimis ſunt *Preces* & *Supplicationes*, eóque nomine in ſcripturis *Vituli labiorum* & *Thymiamata* appellantur, & ad *oblationes Matutinas* & *Veſpertinas* comparantur. Imò & ſecundum veteris Eccleſiæ dialectum *ſacrificare* & *ſupplicare* ſunt ſynonyma, & pro eodem uſurpantur. Nam *ſacrificamus* (inquit *Tertullianus* in Apologetico) *purâ prece pro ſalute Imperatoris, ſed Deo uni & vero*: ubi ut *precem* dicit eſſe *ſacrificium*, ſic etiam affirmat illam ab Eccleſia ſui temporis non *Sanctis* & *Angelis* ſed *uni & vero Deo* offerri ſolitam; nam ibi *Tertullianus* de publicis & communiter receptis, & ab univerſa Eccleſia uſurpatis precandi formulis non obiter ſed ex inſtituto loquitur. Quare cùm *Invocatio* ſit *Sacrificium ſpirituale*, & nulla alia ſub Evangelio ſint ſacrificia, cúmque omnia ſacrificia tam *ſpiritualia* quam *legalia* ſint *ſoli Deo* offerenda, certè non minùs hi qui nunc non ſolum Deum *invocant*, quàm qui olim non ſoli Deo *ſacrificabant*, inter *Idololatras* ſunt cenſendi.

Et reverà pro *Idololatris* à veteri Eccleſiâ ſunt habiti. Nam Synodus *Laodicena* (quam Pontificii ante *Nicenam* numerant) *Can.* 35. Ἀγγέλους ὀνομάζοντας (1.) *illos qui Angelos invocabant* * τὴν κεκρυμμένης εἰδωλολαλίας damnavit. Nam † εἴ τις εὑρεθῇ (inquiunt Patres in illa Synodo) ταύτην τὴν κεκρυμμένην εἰδωλολαλίαν σχολάζων, ἔστω ἀνάθεμα, ὅτι ἐγκατέλιπε τὸν κύριον ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ Θεοῦ, καὶ εἰδωλολατρίᾳ προσῆλθεν. Et hunc eſſe ſenſum hujus Canonis *Theodoretus* (qui *Auguſtino* ferè ‖ σύγχρονος & *Chryſoſtomi* diſcipulus in principio quinti ſæculi floruit) luculentiſſimè teſtatur in Commentariis ſuis ad illum inſignem *Pauli* locum Ep. ad *Coloſ.* c. 2. v. 18. * Μηδεὶς ὑμᾶς καταβραβεύετω θέλων ἐν ταπεινοφροσύνῃ καὶ θρησκείᾳ τῶν ἀγγέλων, &c. ubi hæc habet obſervatu digniſſima. † Οἱ τῷ νόμῳ συνηγορεῦντες, καὶ τοὺς ἀγγέλους σέβειν αὐτοῖς εἰσηγοῦντο. Ἔμεινε δὲ τοῦτο τὸ πάθος ἐν τῇ Φρυγίᾳ καὶ Πισιδίᾳ μέχρι πολλοῦ· ὃ δὴ χάριν καὶ συνελθοῦσα συνόδος ἐν Λαοδικείᾳ τῆς Φρυγίας νόμῳ κεκώλυκε τὸ τοῖς Ἀγγέλοις προσεύχεσθαι. Unde conſtat τὸ τοὺς Ἀγγέλους ὀνομάζειν in *Canone*, & τὸ τοῖς Ἀγγέλοις προσεύχεσθαι in *Theodoreto* illam ipſam eſſe Ἀγγέλων θρησκειαν, quam *Paulus* præcavendam admonet, & Synodus *Laodicena* tanquam κεκρυμμένην εἰδωλολατρίαν damnat.

* *abſcondita idololatria.*

† *Si quis reperiatur operam huic ſive iſti ſecretæ Idololatriæ, Anathema eſto ; quoniam deſeruit D. N. Jeſum Chriſtum, & Idololatriæ ſe adjunxit.*

‖ *contemporaneus.*

* *Let no man beguile you, &c.*

† *Qui legi (Ceremoniali ſcilicet) patrocinabantur, etiam ut Angelos colerent illos* (1.) *Coloſſenſes ſuadebant : permanſit verò hæc prava affectio apud multos in* Phrygia *&* Piſidia. *Hanc verò ob causam, Synodus in* Laodicea Phrygiæ *urbe congregata, lege prohibuit nè quis Angelis ſupplicaret.*

Nec dubium eſſe poteſt, quin eodem Anathematis fulmine *Sanctorum* etiam *Invocatores* percuſſiſſet, ſi tales tunc temporis in Eccleſia extitiſſent ; Nam ſi non licet *Angelos*, multò minùs licet *Sanctos*, aut hominum etiam ſanctiſſimorum animas, invocare : quia quin *Angeli* ſemper aſpiciant faciem Dei nemo unquam dubitavit ; ſed an *Sanctorum animæ* eo gaudeant vel ante conſummationem ſæculi gaviſuri ſint privilegio, multi

multi ex vetuſtiſſimis Eccleſiæ Doctoribus non modò dubitârunt, ſed contrarium affirmârunt; inter quos (ut anteà dixi) *Irenæus*, *Juſtinus Martyr*, *Clemens Romanus*, *Lactantius* cum multis aliis à *Sixto Senenſi* in *Biblioth. ſanct. lib. ſexto* numerantur. Quapropter ex nullis horum *Patrum* ſcriptis idoneum pro *Invocatione Sanctorum* adduci poteſt teſtimonium. Nam cùm fundamentum, cui innititur *Sanctorum Invocatio*, ſit illorum in Cœlis *Dei Intuitio*, quomodò qui negant illos eſſe in Cœlis, poſſunt affirmare illos eſſe invocandos? Quare ſi quid hujuſmodi in aliquibus alicujus illorum *Patrum* ſcriptis oſtenditur, neceſſe eſt, ut vel *librum* eſſe ſuppoſititium, vel *locum* fuiſſe corruptum, vel denique *authorem* (quiſquis fuerit) pugnantia ſecum ſcripſiſſe fateamur. Et præterea vel hinc conſtat, quòd *Invocatio Sanctorum* in illorum *Patrum* temporibus nec in *fidem* nec in *praxin* Eccleſiæ erat recepta, cùm incredibile ſit tales ac tantos Viros, & præcipuos Eccleſiæ Doctores, à communi Eccleſiæ *fide* & *praxi* tam aliena, imò tam ἀσύμφωνα aut ſenſiſſe, aut ſi ſenſiſſent, ſcribere auſos fuiſſe.

Nihilominùs *Pontificii*, quâ ſunt verecundiâ, non modò ex aliquibus horum *Patrum* ſcriptis, ſed quod magis mirandum eſt, ex ipſius *Veteris Inſtrumenti* libris, quicquid huic κατάθεσει δυλόω videtur, & ad *Sanctorum Invocationem* aut defendendam aut excuſandam detorqueri poteſt, avidè arripiunt; quamvis omnes Veterum *Sanctorum animas*, uſque ad deſcenſum Chriſti ad Inferos, Cœlo excluſas, & in *Limbo* neſcio quo (ubi quid in terris gerebatur omninò ignorabant) detentas fuiſſe, ipſi aſſerant. Quâ igitur aut in Deum fide, aut in homines verecundiâ, aut ſecum ipſis conſtantiâ & συμφωνίᾳ, iſtiuſmodi teſtimonia proferre poſſint, ipſi viderint.

Intereà non mirum eſt quod dicis (*eruditiſſime* VLITI) ab illis qui *Sanctorum invocationem* defendunt, confidenter allegari non modò *Chryſoſtomum*, *Hieronymum*, alióſque quarti ſæculi authores, ſed ipſum etiam *Auguſtinum*; cùm *Bellarminus* non tantùm hos & alios

PATRUM *teſtimonia expenduntur.*

alios quarti ſæculi Patres, ſed ipſum *Irenæum*, & *Dionyſium* (quem vocat *Areopagitam*) *Irenæo*, ut Pontificiis placet, antiquiorem & Apoſtolis coætaneum, non minùs confidenter alleget.

Pſeudo-DIONYSII.

Et *Dionyſium* quidem ſuum ſibi habeat, ſed non *Areopagitam*, qui Apoſtolis reverà coætaneus fuit, utpote à *Paulo* ad fidem converſus; ſed hunc *Bellarmini Dionyſium*, authorem ſcilicet librorum *De cœleſti Hierarchia*, *Myſtica Theol.* &c. veterem illum *Areopagitam* non fuiſſe, ex *Euſebio* & *Hieronymo* conſtat, qui nullam hujus *Dionyſii* aut talium Librorum mentionem faciunt, quamvis omnium, quæ ex veterum ante illorum ætatem ſcriptis ſupererant, *catalogum* diligentiſſimè confecerint. Prætereà hic *pſeudo-Dionyſius* citat *Clementem* philoſophum (*Alexandrinum* ſcilicet) qui initio tertii ſæculi vixit; item de *Templis*, de *Altaribus*, de *Choro*, de *Catechumenis* extra fores Templi ſtatuendis, & de aliis ejuſdem generis multa ſcribit, quorum nihil adhuc erat *Areopagita* ſuperſtite; imò & *Monachorum* meminit, quorum primos fuiſſe *Paulum* & *Antonium* (qui poſt exactum ſæculum tertium vixerunt) ipſi *Pontificii* fatentur. Ex quibus omnibus ſatis conſtat hunc *Dionyſium* non fuiſſe *Areopagitam*; & prætereà quòd (quiſquis fuerit) poſt *Euſebium* & *Hieronymum*, adeóque poſt quarti ſæculi finem vixerit. Quibus de cauſis etiam ab ipſis Pontificiis, *Laurentio Vallâ* ſcilicet, *Eraſmo* & *Grocino* hic *Dionyſius* inter *Apocryphos* authores numeratur.

Vid. Eraſm. *Annot. ad Act.* c. 17. v. 34.

IRENÆI.

Quod attinet *Irenæum*, floruit quidem ille *ſecundo* poſt *Chriſtum* ſæculo: ſed operæ pretium eſt videre quid ex illo *Bellarminus* pro *Invocatione Sanctorum* expiſcatus fuerit; nempè, *Quòd ſicut* Eva *ſeducta eſt ut effugeret Deum*, *ſic* Maria *ſuaſa eſt obedire Deo*, *ut virginis* Evæ *virgo* Maria *fieret Advocata*; quibus *Irenæi* verbis ſubjungit *Bellarminus*, *Quid clarius?* imò quid obſcurius? nam quomodò potuit *Maria* poſt mortem ſuam advocata eſſe *Evæ* dum viveret? cum *Eva* tot annorum Millenis ante *Mariam* natam mortua fuerit. Deinde poſito *Mariam* fuiſſe advoca-

advocatam *Evæ*, quia *Maria* ſemen Benedictum peperit, *Evæ* primò promiſſum; quis idcirco concedet *Bellarmino*, *Mariam* ab *Eva* fuiſſe invocandam? nam non quia *Sancti* pro nobis orant, ideo orandi ſunt à nobis. Et præterea *Irenæus* unus ex illis Patribus fuit, qui *Sanctos* nondum eſſe in cœlis putârunt, ideóque neminem *Sanctorum* advocatum pro nobis, nedum invocandum à nobis eſſe cenſuit. Denique *Irenæus* ſuam ipſius orandi formulam deſcribens *lib.* 3. *adverſ. Hær.* cap. 6. *Ego*, inquit, *invoco te Domine*, *Deus* Abrahami, *Deus* Iſaac, *Deus* Jacob, *Pater Domini noſtri Jeſu Chriſti — per Dominum noſtrum Jeſum Chriſtum*; Nulla ibi, vel alibi apud *Irenæum* inter precandum factâ *Mariæ* vel alicujus *Sanctorum* mentione; ſed ut *ad Deum ſolum*, ſic *per Chriſtum ſolum* dirigit orationem.

CORNELII *Papæ.*

Præter hunc *Irenæum* ex *Græcis* (illúmque in unico illo obſcuro loco) & *Cornelium* Papam (qui *Cypriano* coætaneus fuit) ex *Latinis*, neminem citat *Bellarminus* ſæculo quarto ſuperiorem. Illa verò quæ apud illum ſunt *Cornelii* Papæ verba dicunt quidem *intercedere Apoſtolos pro nobis*, de noſtra autem Apoſtolorum Invocatione nihil affirmant. Ubinam autem ſunt illa *Cornelii* verba, præterquàm in *Bellarmino*, nondum reperio. Nam cùm ipſe *Bellarminus de Script. Eccleſ.* p. 181. quatuor tantùm *Cornelii* Epiſtolas, nec eas integras ſupereſſe dicat, quarum duæ ſunt inter Epiſtolas *Cypriani*, ad *Cyprianum* ſcilicet ſcriptæ; tertia apud *Euſeb. Hiſt. lib.* 6. c. 35. quarta verò ad *Lupicinum* (quam brevem eſſe dicit) in *Tom.* 1. *Biblioth. ſanct. Patrum*; Ego tres priores diligenter legi, in quarum nulla extant illa apud *Bellarminum* verba, nec illis vel ſono vel ſenſu ſimilia; adeò ut aut nullibi ſint, aut in illa brevi ad *Lupicinum* Epiſtola, quod an verum ſit nécne non poſſum pronunciare, quia *Bibliothecam* illam *Patrum* non habeo; quamvis *Bellarminus* illam Epiſtolam non videatur innuere; Nam dicit *Cornelium* habere illa verba in prima Epiſtola *De tranſlatione corporum Apoſtolorum*, ac ſi plures ejus eſſent illius argumenti Epiſtolæ; quod quomodò cum illis quæ de *Cornelii* ſcriptis dicit, in *lib. de Script. Eccleſ.* conſtare poſſit,

ego quidem non video; ſed quare non citat *Bellarminus Cyprianum* ipſum, quem novit in illa eſſe *Cornelii* ſententia, quòd *Sancti* defuncti intercedant pro viventibus? nempè quia animadverterat clarum eſſe ex *Cypriano*, quòd quamvis *Sancti* defuncti intercedant pro nobis, non tamen ſunt ideò invocandi à nobis, ſed potiùs rogandi à nobis dum adhuc in hac vita ſunt, ut in illa altera vita, ſi priùs hinc emigrent, noſtri memores eſſe velint. Nam *lib.* 1. *Ep.* 1. ad *Cornelium*, *Memores*, inquit *Cyprianus*, *noſtri invicem ſimus, utrobique pro nobis ſemper orantes: & ſi quis noſtrum prior divinæ dignationis celeritate præceſſerit, perſeveret apud Deum noſtra dilectio; pro fratribus & ſororibus noſtris apud miſericordiam patris non ceſſet oratio.* Sed quid opus fuiſſet hâc prænonitione, aut quare hanc *prolepticam* ſui commendationem *Cornelianis* poſt mortem precibus, *Cornelio* adhuc ſuperſtite, neceſſariam eſſe judicabat *Cyprianus*, ſi mortuos *invocandos* aut invocantium preces exaudituros eſſe credidiſſet? quod cùm non lateret *Bellarminum*, maluit minùs appoſito & minùs certo *Cornelii*, quàm magìs appoſito & magìs certo *Cypriani* pro *interceſſione Sanctorum* teſtimonio uti.

Patrum quarti ſæculi.

Et reverà, cùm ſeriò agunt *Pontificii*, intra quarti ſæculi & ſequentium terminos ſibi conſiſtendum eſſe ſentiunt. Et illa quibus maximè innituntur, vel quarti ſæculi Teſtimonia, non ſunt ex *Dogmaticis*, vel *Didacticis*, imò nec ex *Polemicis*, ſed maximam partem vel ex *Rhetoricis*, vel ex *Poeticis* Patrum ſcriptis deſumpta; *Baſilii* ſcilicet, *Nyſſeni* & *Nazianzeni*; itémque *Paulini* & *Prudentii*; quos quamvis omnes pios, eruditos, & in ſuo genere viros admirabiles eſſe ſentiam; tamen non poſſum non dolere illos tantos viros & de Eccleſia Dei cætera omnia tam benè meritos, illorum admiratoribus & ſequacibus graviſſimum errorem errandi anſam præbuiſſe; dum *Rhetorico* & *Poetico* ſuo genio nimiùm indulgent, adeóque incautiùs aliquando & * ἀκυρολογοτέρως in *Panegyricis* & *Carminibus* ſuis loquuntur. Conantur quidem & alios magni nominis hujus quarti ſæculi viros ad ſuas partes in hac cauſa pertrahere, ſed invitos

* *magìs impropriè.*

invitos & repugnantes; *Athanasium* scilicet, *Chrysostomum* & *Cyrillum* ex Græcis; *Hilarium* verò, *Ambrosium*, *Hieronymum* & *Augustinum* etiam ex Latinis. *Græcorum.*

Sed *primùm*, locus ille ex *Athanasio* à *Bellarmino* pro *Invocatione Beatæ Virginis* allegatus, ATHANASII. desumitur ex Sermone quodam *De sanctissima Deipara*, seu de Annunciatione: sed hunc Sermonem falsò adscriptum esse *Athanasio* non affirmat modò sed probat *Baronius Tom.* 1. *Ann.* 48. *Sect.* 19, 20. Et prætereà *Athanasius* (ut notum est) ex *Christi Invocatione* probat illum esse Deum; de *Virgine* verò loquens in *Orat.* 3. *contra Arianos* dicit illam esse sororem nostram, ideóque creaturam; * κτίσμα autem κτίσματι δ' προσκυνεῖν. * *Creaturam creaturæ non oportet aut non licet se prosternere.*

Secundò, locus quem profert *Bellarminus* ex *Chrysostomo*, desumitur ex *Homilia* 66. *ad Populum Antiochenum*: sed quâ fronte? cùm ipse *Bellarminus de Script. Eccles.* p. 162. dicat in *tomo* 5. *Chrysostomi* omnia ferè esse certa & indubitata, EXCEPTIS HOMILIIS *ad Popul. Antioch. ex quibus*, inquit, *viginti & una tantùm reperiri dicuntur Manuscriptæ in antiquis Bibliothecis.* Hæc ipse *Bellarminus.* Illa itaque quæ transcribit verba, tanquam *Chrysostomi*, sunt ipso Judice incerti Authoris: sed quia pro *Invocatione Sanctorum* apertè faciunt, spuria illa tam clari parentis nomine cohonestare voluit, ut incautis & imperitis lectoribus faciliùs imponeret. CHRYSOSTOMI.

Sed alios fortasse magis genuinos ex *Chrysostomo* habet locos: subindicat quidem se habere, sed habeat nécne non constat; nam subindicat tantùm, non transcribit; transcripturus proculdubio, si ex re suâ fuisset. Sed novit *Bellarminus Chrysostomum* in illis ipsis, quos indigitat, locis, aut causæ suæ adversari, aut quod ad causam pertinet nihil omninò dicere.

I. Nam in *Homil.* 5. *in Matth.* (qui est *primus*, ex illis designatis, locus) dicit quidem *Chrysostomus*, **Ἔχουσι μὲν δυνάμιν αἱ δεήσεις τῶν Ἁγίων μεγάλην. Sed quos †Ἁγίους intelligit ibi *Chrysostomus*, *magnam quidem habent vim sanctorum preces. † sanctos.

vivos,

vivos vel *defunctos?* vivos certè; ut ex contextu patet, imò ut ipſe *Bellarminus* (in Reſponſione ad argumenta adverſariorum) poſteà fatetur: adeò ut nihil ſit in hac *Homilia*, quod illi proſit, ſed eſt quod obſit: Nam in ſequentibus * Ὁ Θεὸς (inquit *Chryſoſtomus*) ἡμῶν μᾶλλον θέλει βέλεται τὴν χάριν, ἢ ἑτέροις ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν· ἵνα καὶ παῤῥησίας ἀπολαύωμεν, καὶ βελτίονες γινώμεθα, ἀναθαῤῥοῦντες αὐτοὶ λῦσαι τὴν ὀργήν· ὅτω τὴν Χαναναίαν ἠλέησεν, ὅτω τὴν πόρνην ἔσωσεν, ὅτω τ̃ ληστὴν, ἀθανὸς γενόμενος μαθητὴς, καὶ προφάτης. Sequitur quidem † Καὶ ταῦτα λέγω οὐχ ἵνα μὴ ἱκετεύωμεν τοὺς ἁγίους, ἀλλὰ ἵνα μὴ ῥᾳθυμῶμεν μηδὲ ἀναπίπτοντες αὐτοὶ καὶ καθεύδοντες, ἑτέροις τὰ καθ' ἡμᾶς ἐπιτρέπωμεν μόνοις. Sed hic etiam, ut anteà, per ‖ Ἁγίους intelligit illos *Sanctos Vivos*, quorum precibus & interceſſionibus quidam nimiùm deferentes & nimiùm fidentes, pro ſemetipſis Deum orare aut propter * ῥᾳθυμίαν negligebant, aut propter, † μικροψυχίαν ex conſcientia peccatorum ſuorum non audebant. Hortatur itaque illos, ut exemplo *Canaanitidis*, *Mariæ Magdalenæ*, & *Latronis* in Cruce (qui nemine *Sanctorum* pro illis ſuffragante orabant pro ſemetipſis, & quamvis maximi peccatorum exiſtentes à Deo ſunt exauditi) pro ſe quiſque Deum orarent, ſed ita tamen ut aliorum pro ipſis preces non contemnerent. Nam *quamvis*, inquit, *Deus unumquemque pro ſe libentiùs quàm alium pro alio orantem exaudiat, tamen habent etiam & vim ſuam*, inquit, *aliorum pro aliis preces*, modò qui pro aliis Deum orant, ſint ipſi *Sancti* & Deo chari. Et hunc eſſe verum hujus loci intellectum cuilibet contextum conſulenti facilè conſtabit. Utcunque verò ſe res habet, neceſſe eſt per *Sanctos* ut intelligamus vel ſanctos qui adhuc ſunt in vivis, vel illos qui jam ſunt in cœlis. Si *prius*, nihil hic eſt aut pro aut contra *Invocationem Sanctorum*, qui ſunt defuncti: ſi *poſterius*, neceſſe eſt ut fateamur, quod ſecundum *Chryſoſtomum*

* *Deus libentiùs nobiſmet ipſis, quàm aliis pro nobis largitur gratiam; ut & fiduciæ fructum capiamus, & ruchiores efficiamur, operam navantes ipſi iracundiam dei deprecari: ſic* Cananitidis *miſertus eſt, ſic adulterii ream ſalvavit, ſic latronem cùm nullus adeſſet Mediator vel patronus.*

† *Hæc autem dico, non ut non imploremus ſanctos; ſed nè ipſi negligentes, ſupini & obdormientes aliis ſolummodò res noſtras permittamus.* ‖ *ſanctos.*

* *ſocordiam.*

† *animi abjectionem.*

mum

mum gratiores ſunt peccatoris pœnitentis pro ſe preces, quàm *Sanctorum* (etiam illorum qui in cœlis ſunt) pro illo interceſſiones; Quo quid dici poteſt contra *Invocationem Sanctorum*, & contra fiduciam in illorum ſuffragiis collocandam efficacius? Et certè quamplurimis in locis hoc idem agit *Chryſoſtomus*; ut peccatores pœnitentes, & pro re qualibet auxilii divini indigentes, quantumvis indignos ſe exiſtimant, rectà & per ſe, & abſque omni *Interceſſorum* ambage, ad ipſum *Chriſtum* ire ſuadeat.

Sed ex omnibus unum tantummodò, ex *Homilia*, * εἰς τ'ὼ Ὀπίλυσιν τ᾽ Χαναναίας, tibi deſcribam: nam ibi illam feminam non ad Apoſtolos, nec per Apoſtolos ad illorum Magiſtrum, ſed ad ipſum *Chriſtum* † ἀμέσως accedentem proponit omnibus in Exemplum. *Quæ quidem femina*, inquit, ‖ Καίτοι ὅτω πονηρὰ οὖσα καὶ παράνομος, ἐτόλμησε προσελθεῖν. Καὶ ὅρα γυναικὸς φιλοσοφίαν· ὃ παρακαλεῖ Ἰάκωβον, ὃ δεῖται Ἰωάννης, οὐδὲ προσέρχεται Πέτρῳ· ἀλλὰ διέτεμε τ᾽ χορόν. (dicens aut quaſi diceret) οὐκ ἔχω μέσιτα χρείαν· ἀλλὰ λαβοῦσα μετανοιαν συνήγορον αὐτῇ τῇ πηγῇ προσέρχομαι· διὰ τοῦτο κατέβη, διὰ τοῦτο σάρκα ἀνέλαβεν, ἵνα κἀγὼ αὐτῷ διαλεχθῶ. Ἄνω τὰ Χερουβὶμ αὐτὸν τρέμει καὶ κάτω πόρνη αὐτῷ διαλέγεται. Et concludit cum exhortatione ab hoc exemplo deducta. * Πάντα τοίνυν εἰδὼς ἐν ταῖς δεήσεσι, ἀγαπητὲ, γίνεσθαι, τὼ Χαναναίαν μίμησαι· σὺ τ᾽ διαύτιλον κάλεσον, μὴ γὰρ ἄνθρωπός ἐστιν, ἵνα ἀπέλθῃς εἰς τόπον; Θεὸς αἰεὶ ἐγγύς ὅστιν. Ἐὰν θέλῃς παρακαλέσαι ἄνθρωπον, ἐρωτᾷς τὶ ποιεῖ; καθεύδει, ἀσχολεῖται, ὁ διακονῶν οὐκ ἀποκρίνεταί σοι. Ἐπὶ δὲ τ᾽ Θεῷ οὐδὲν τούτων· ὅπου ἐὰν ἀπέλθῃς καὶ καλέσῃς, ἀκούει· οὐκ ἀσχολία, ὁ με-

* *ad explicationem loci illius de* Canaanitidis *ad Chriſtum acceſſu.*

† ἀμέσως (1) *immediatè abſque Mediatore.*

‖ *Quamvis adeò mala & peccatrix eſſet, auſa eſt accedere. Adverte verò mulieris ſagacitatem*; Jacobum *non invocat*, Johannem *non implorat, neque ad* Petrum *ſupplex accedit: ſed perrumpens (Apoſtolorum) chorum, Non opus eſt*, inquit, *mihi Interceſſore, ſed pœnitentiâ aſſumptâ pro advocato, ad ipſum (miſericordiæ) fontem accedo: Propter hoc deſcendit (è cœlo) propter hoc carnem aſſumpſit, ut vel ego illum alloquerer. Suprà trementes Cherubim formidant illum, & infrà peccatrix muliercula cum illo familiariter confabulatur.*

* *Quandoquidem itaque (Dilecte) omnem in precibus ſalutis ſpem eſſe intelligas, imitare Canaanitidem, tu Dominum ipſum invoca. Nam non eſt Homo, ut abeas ad locum, Deus ſemper in propinquo eſt. Si quid vis cum homine, rogas quid agit, an dormiat, an occupatus ſit? famulus non reſpondet. Apud Deum verò, nihil hujuſmodi: ubicunque es*

& *peccatrix eſſet, auſa eſt accedere. Adverte verò mulieris ſagacitatem*; Jacobum *non invocat*, Johannem *non implorat, neque ad* Petrum *ſupplex accedit: ſed perrumpens (Apoſtolorum) chorum, Non opus eſt*, inquit, *mihi Interceſſore, ſed pœnitentiâ aſſumptâ pro advocato, ad ipſum (miſericordiæ) fontem accedo: Propter hoc deſcendit (è cœlo) propter hoc carnem aſſumpſit, ut vel ego illum alloquerer. Suprà trementes Cherubim formidant illum, & infrà peccatrix muliercula cum illo familiariter confabulatur.*

* *Quandoquidem itaque (Dilecte) omnem in precibus ſalutis ſpem eſſe intelligas, imitare Canaanitidem, tu Dominum ipſum invoca. Nam non eſt Homo, ut abeas ad locum, Deus ſemper in propinquo eſt. Si quid vis cum homine, rogas quid agit, an dormiat, an occupatus ſit? famulus non reſpondet. Apud Deum verò, nihil hujuſmodi: ubicunque es*

& invocat, exaudit: nec negotium, nec internuncius, nec miniſter te diſcludit.

ὁ μεσίτης, ὁ διάκονος & διαλείχιζει. Quid clarius, quid plenius, quid nervoſius dici potuit ad oſtendendum nullo nobis opus eſſe *Mediatore* ad Chriſtum, neque ad Deum præter Chriſtum? Nam cùm duo potiſſimùm dici ſoleant, quare non niſi mediantibus *Sanctis* ad Deum ſit accedendum: alterum *ex parte noſtri*, quia ſcilicet peccatis inquinati & cooperti indigni ſumus, qui ipſum Deum aut Chriſtum ἀμέσως ſeu abſque Mediatore alloquamur: alterum verò *ex parte Dei*, quia nimirùm ſi non licet aut non decet *Regem* aliquem hîc in terris niſi per *Aulicos* adire; multò minùs decet illum qui eſt in cœlis *Regem regum & Dominum dominantium*, niſi per *Sanctos* & *Angelos* qui ejus ſunt quaſi Aulici & familiares, interpellare; utrique harum * προφάσεων (in illis quæ ſuperiùs deſcripſi verbis) *Chryſoſtomus* occurrit, & utramque tollit, ac ſi tunc naſcenti huic ſuperſtitioni de induſtria ſe opponere, & ipſas ejus radices ex animis hominum evellere, ſtuduiſſet.

* *Prætextuum.*

II. Sed pergamus; *ſecundus* itaque ex *Chryſoſtomo*, quem indicat *Bellarminus* ſed non profert, locus dicitur eſſe in *Hom.* 8. *in Matth.* ſed perlectâ ſemel atque iterum integrâ illâ *Homiliâ*, nihil hujus argumenti affine reperio. Et quod non eſt, non potuit proferri.

III. *Tertius* eſt ex *Hom.* 43. *ad Gen.* ubi invenio tantundem, hoc eſt, nihil. Sed fortaſſe errore Typographi ponitur *Homil.* 43. pro 44. nam ibi quidem dicitur, quòd † ἡ παρὰ τῶν ἁγίων πρεσβεία τὰ μέγιστα ἡμῖν ὠνίνησιν. Sed hic iterum per πρεσβείαν ἁγίων intelligit *deprecationes* vivorum pro vivis, ut manifeſtum eſt ex præcedentibus & ſequentibus. Nam loquitur de *Loti* ab excidio *Sodomitico* liberatione propter deprecationem *Abrahæ*. Et prætereà ſi de defunctorum pro vivis interpellatione hoc dictum eſſet; probaret quidem *Chryſoſtomum* exiſtimâſſe *Sanctos* defunctos pro nobis Deum orare, ſed non idcirco à nobis orandos eſſe.

† *Deprecatio Sanctorum multum nos adjuvat.*

IV. *Quartus* eſt ex *Hom.* 1. in priorem ad *Theſſ.* ubi iterum, quod de utilitate illarum precum, quæ a viventibus pro

pro ſe & aliis invicem Deo offeruntur, dicitur, ad *defunctos* transfertur, ut conſtat ex exemplis ibi allatis, nempè precum totius Eccleſiæ pro *Petro* quando erat in vinculis; item *Philippenſium* & *Corinthiorum* pro *Paulo*; nec non ſancti *Jobi* pro amicis ſuis, quibus Deus ejus nomine infenſus erat.

Sed ſi licet orare *Sanctos in terris*, ut pro nobis apud Deum intercedant, quare non *Sanctos* qui ſunt *in cælis?* (ſic enim argutantur Pontificii) *Obj.*

Reſpondeo *primùm*, quia præcepit Deus ut *vivi* pro vivis invicem orarent, & promiſit ſe tales orationes exauditurum; ſed an *defuncti* pro vivis orent nécne, non conſtat ex Scripturis, neque ullum omninò extat vel præceptum *Sanctos* qui ſunt in cœlis *Invocandi*, vel promiſſum quòd hujuſmodi Invocatio vel Deo vel Sanctis erit grata, aut invocantibus profutura. *Reſp.* *Secundò*, quia paſſim in Scripturis habemus exempla viventium intercedentium pro viventibus, itémque aliorum pro ſe preces expetentium, & ſuas etiam aliis preces promittentium; ſed nullum prorſus eſt exemplum nec in Scriptura, nec in primitiva Eccleſia invocandi aliquem ex defunctis. *Tertiò*, quia pro certo ſcimus commilitones noſtros hîc in terra, quando verbo vel ſcripto illos rogamus ut pro nobis apud communem Patrem intercedant, ſentire & intelligere quid illud eſt quod ab illis præſtari volumus; ſed an *Sancti* qui ſunt in cœlis videant quæ hîc agimus, aut audiant quæ hîc loquimur, & multò magis an intimos cordis noſtri receſſus ſcrutari poſſint, ut an ſimulatè vel ex animo precemur certò ſciant, hoc nemini mortalium conſtat, aut abſque ſpeciali revelatione conſtare poteſt. *Quartò* denique nos non *invocamus* alios in hac vita, ut pro nobis orent, ſed *oramus* ut illum, qui ſolus invocandus eſt, pro nobis & cum nobis invocent: neque rogamus illos ut in virtute ſuorum meritorum officium *interceſſionis* pro nobis exerceant, ſed ut unà nobiſcum per communem Interceſſorem *Jeſum Chriſtum* Deum Patrem adeant.

Sed alio prorſus modo invocantur à Pontificiis *Sancti* qui ſunt in cœlis: Nam *Aquinas* 2. *ſecundæ quæſt.* 83. *art.* 4. *Oratio*, inquit, *offertur Sanctis, ut eorum interpellatione & meritis*

ritis ſortiatur effectum: & *Bellarminus Cap.* 20. *de Sanct. beat.* dicit *Sanctos, quamvis jam nec ſibi nec aliis mereantur, tamen ex meritis præcedentibus & ſibi & aliis impetrare quod orant.* Quare cùm tam diſpar ſit ratio & diverſus modus *rogandi vivos* ut pro nobis orent, & *invocandi mortuos* ut pro nobis intercedant, non mirum eſt ſi alterum ſit licitum & utile; alterum verò non inutile modò ſed etiam illicitum.

Sed ut revertamur ad *Chryſoſtomum*; verum eſt quod etiam de *Sanctorum* defunctorum precibus in illa *Homilia* poſtremò citata loquitur, ex *Jer.* 15. 1. * Ἐὰν ϛῇ Μωϋσῆς καὶ Σαμουὴλ, &c. ſed obſervandum eſt, quòd non loquitur de illis tanquam de defunctis, ſed per modum ſupponentis illos jam vivere, aut loquentis de illis ac ſi præſentes tunc eſſent; nam de *Moſe* loquens, Εἰ τοίνυν, inquit, ἔτυχε νεῦ ἦν, καὶ ταῦτα ἔλεγεν, ἐκ ἂν ἐπέτυχε· καὶ εἰ Σαμουὴλ πάλιν, &c. *Si* Moſes *hic nunc eſſet, ſi* Samuel *coram me nunc ſtaret.* Sed hîc & alibi paſſim in hujus Patris ſcriptis, quod de vivorum interceſſione pro vivis ab illo dicitur, *Pontificii* ſolent transferre ad *Sanctos* qui ſunt in cœlis, & quidlibet ex quolibet concludere potiùs quàm cauſæ, quam ſemel defendendam ſuſceperunt, deeſſe.

* *Si* Moſes *ſtaret &* Samuel.

V. Ultimus ex *Chryſoſtomo* locus eſt ex Sermone ejus in *Juventinum* & *Maximum* Martyres; in quo quidem ſermone *Panegyricum* agens, de illorum Martyrum apud Deum *Interceſſione* magnificè loquitur, uti etiam de frequentandis illorum memoriis; ſed de illorum *Invocatione* aut de illis invocandis nè verbum quidem. Jam verò nos non negamus quin *Chryſoſtomus* cum multis aliis & hujus & ſuperioris ſæculi Patribus, crediderit & ſanctos eſſe in cœlis, & ibi pro Eccleſia adhuc in terris militante apud Deum intercedere; ſed quòd propterea aut *Chryſoſtomus* ipſe *Sanctos* invocaverit, aut illorum *Invocationem* ſuaſerit, docuerit, aut probaverit, hoc eſt quod nos negamus, & quod *Pontificii*, quamvis omnem moveant lapidem, nunquam oſtendent.

CYRILLI. Præter *Athanaſium* & *Chryſoſtomum*, *Cyrillum* nominat *Bellarminus* tanquam *Invocationi Sanctorum*

ctorum patrocinantem. Sed liber quem designat *Cyrilli* est Apocryphus, *Catecheses* scilicet *Mystagogicæ*, quas *Hæschelius* sive *Velserus* (teste *Possevino*) dicit esse in Bibliotheca *Auspurgensi* cum hac inscriptione * Μυσταγωγικαὶ κατηχήσεις πέντε Ἰωάννου Ἐπισκόπου Ἱεροσολύμων. Et præterea locus ille à *Bellarmino* ex hoc libro desumptus non probat *Sanctos* à nobis esse *invocandos*, sed tantùm intercessionem Sanctorum pro nobis.

* *Mystagogicæ Catecheses quinque* Johannis *Episcopi* Hierosolymitani.

Denique quæ profert *Bellarminus* pro *Invocatione Sanctorum* ex *Theodoreto*, desumpta sunt ex *Historia Patrum*, & lib. *De curandis Græcorum affectibus*. Sed author *Hist. Pat.* narrat mortem *Simeonis*, & ejus post mortem miracula; atqui *Theodoretus* mortuus est ante *Simeonem*, teste *Baronio*; non scripsit itaque illam Historiam. Libri autem *De curand. Græc. affec.* sunt dubiæ fidei, quia *Nicephorus* in Catalogo lucubrationum *Theodoreti* nullam illorum mentionem facit: & quia *Invocatio Sanctorum* quæ hic probatur pugnat cum illis, quæ ex indubitatis *Theodoreti* scriptis contra Angelorum invocationem supra ostendimus.

THEODORETI

Vides igitur quàm malâ fide & quàm infeliciter hi *Græci Patres* à Pontificiis in hac causa allegantur. Videamus jam an magis candidè & ingenuè erga *Latinos Patres* se gesserint.

Sed imprimis observare oportet ex Patribus tam *Græcis* quàm *Latinis* quosdam; illósque ex vetustioribus, neque nostram *Sanctorum Invocationem*, neque Sanctorum pro nobis *Intercessionem* agnovisse; utpote quos nondum in cœlis esse crediderunt. Et hinc patet ratio, quare *Angelorum* cultus priùs irrepserit in Ecclesiam, quàm *Sanctorum*; quia nimirùm humanarum rerum curam & administrationem *Angelis* à Deo demandatam esse semper fuit creditum, etiam ab illis, qui nullum vivis cum defunctis commercium esse credebant, nec ullam vitâ functis illarum quæ in hac vita agerentur rerum cognitionem: *Secundò* observandum.

Obs.

vandum eſt etiam alios ex Patribus tam *Græcis* quàm *Latinis* (quorum omnium primus fuit *Origenes*) credidiſſe res noſtras non *Angelis* modò ſed & *Sanctis* vitâ functis curæ eſſe; ſed nec *Angelos* neque *Sanctos* idcirco colendos aut invocandos eſſe, quamvis pro nobis apud Deum intercederent. *Tertiò* item notandum eſt ex illis hujus ſecundi ordinis Patribus alios credidiſſe quidem *Sanctos* in cœlo *triumphantes* ſolicitos eſſe pro *Eccleſia militante* in terris collectivè ſumpta, & pro ea orare, utpote quam norunt ſub Cruce gemere, ſed abſque aliquâ tamen rerum aut perſonarum particularium diſtinctione aut cognitione. Et in hac ſententia fuit *Auguſtinus*: *Nam mortuis*, inquit, *ita eſt cura de vivis, quamvis quid agant omninò neſciant, ſicut nobis eſt cura de mortuis quamvis quid agant utique neſciamus.* Alios verò credidiſſe inſuper, animas *Martyrum* & *Sanctorum* apud *Memorias* ſuas præſentes eſſe, rebus hominum intereſſe, eaſque cognoſcere & curare; imò cum precantibus ad illorum *Memorias* comprecari, ideóque potiſſimùm ad *Martyrum* monumenta precaturi concurrebant. Et hic ſanè gradus fuit *Invocationi* proximus, & hinc ad *Invocationem* facilis & proclivis fuit tranſitus. Quidam verò hujus *ſæculi quarti* Patres vel huc uſque progreſſi, hîc tamen ſubſiſtebant; nam quamvis *Sanctos* non tantùm *pro* ipſis, ſed *cum* ipſis orare crederent, *Sanctos* tamen nec ipſi invocabant, nec fas eſſe illos invocare arbitrabantur; uti nec *Angelos*, quamvis de *Angelorum* præſentia, cognitione, & rerum humanarum curâ, quàm *Sanctorum*, certiores eſſent.

Lib. De cura pro mortuis gerenda.

Latinorum.

HILARII.

Inter hos erant, qui à *Bellarmino* pro *Sanctorum Invocatione* teſtes producuntur, *Ambroſius* & *Hieronymus*: *Hilarius* enim videtur ejuſdem ſententiæ fuiſſe cum *Auguſtino*. Et teſtimonium ejus à *Bellarmino* prolatum, præterquàm quod de *Angelis* ſolis loquitur, nihil habet pro noſtra *Angelorum Invocatione*, quamvis dicat noſtram infirmitatem illorum *Interceſſione* apud Deum indigere. Sed ab *Angelorum* aut *Sanctorum* pro nobis *Interceſſione* ad noſtram illorum *Invocationem* non valet argumentum, ut ſæpiùs jam dixi. Alter verò eſt ex *Hilario* locus

locus (quem *Bellarminus* maluit innuere quàm proferre) ex Enarrationibus ſcilicet ejus ad *Pſal.* 124. ubi reverà *Hilarius* dicit per *Montes circa* Jeruſalem intelligi *Angelos*, addítque *in illis non leve eſſe præſidium*, ſicut etiam in *Apoſtolis*, *Patriarchis* & *Prophetis*, vel potiùs (ut per * ἐπανόρθωσιν ibi loquitur) in *Angelis*. Sed non dicit aut *Patriarchas*, aut *Prophetas*, aut *Apoſtolos*, aut *Angelos* eſſe *invocandos*; imò ſi ſic dixiſſet, ſecundum *Pontificios* non verum dixerat; Nam *Apoſtoli* nondum erant nati, & *Patriarcharum*, *Prophetarúm*que animæ in *Patrum limbo* erant; ubi nec aliis præſidio eſſe potuiſſent, nec ipſi ab aliis invocari debuiſſent. Sed quare non addit *Bellarminus* quod apud *Hilarium* eodem loco ſequitur, *Bonum ſiquidem eſſe præſidium Angeli, ſed melius Domini, qui Evangelium conſummans dixit, Ego vobiſcum ſum omnibus diebus uſque ad conſummationem ſæculi. Adeſt enim* (inquit *Hilarius*) *& cùm fideliter invocatur per naturam ſuam præſens eſt.* Ex quibus verbis probatur primò quòd Chriſtus eſt Deus, quia per naturam præſens eſt ubicunque invocatur. Secundò quòd ille ſolus, qui per naturam ſuam, ubicunque invocatur, præſens eſſe poteſt, invocari debeat.

* *ſui ipſius correctionem.*

Ambroſium quod attinet, negari non poteſt, quin in Lib. *de Viduis* ſic ſcripſerit. OBSECRANDOS *eſſe Angelos & Martyres, qui nobis ad præſidium dati ſunt, & qui poſſunt* (ut ibidem ſequitur) *pro peccatis rogare noſtris, utpote qui* PROPRIO *ſanguine, ſi qua habuerunt, peccata laverunt ſua.* Sed hîc rogo *Bellarminum*, primùm an ille ipſe dubitat cum *Ambroſio*, utrum *Martyres* aliqua habuerint peccata? Deinde an cum *Ambroſio* audeat dicere *Martyres* ſua ipſorum peccata ſuo ipſorum ſanguine laviſſe? ſin per imprudentiam, aut nimium erga *Martyres* affectum lapſus fuerit *Ambroſius* in una parte ſententiæ, quare non in altera? imò in utraque? Et ego quidem (pro mea in *Ambroſium* reverentia) perſuaſum habeo, quòd ſi ille (quemadmodùm *Auguſtinus* fecit) *Retractationes* ſcripſiſſet, hanc imprimis ſententiam nigro carbone ipſe notâſſet, & ex ſuis libris deleviſſet: & profectò credibile eſt hoc illum implicitè

AMBROSII.

citè & *in voto* (ut loquuntur) feciſſe, cùm in primo *de Officiis* libro ſic loquatur. *Alii diſcunt priuſquam doceant, & ab alio accipiunt quod aliis tradant: quod nè ipſum quidem mihi accidit, qui raptus de tribunalibus & adminiſtrationis infulis ad Sacerdotium, docere vos cœpi, quod ipſe non didici. Itaque factum eſt ut priùs docere incipiam quàm diſcere*, &c. Quæ mihi videtur ingenua confeſſio vel agnoſcentis quòd erravit, vel metuentis ſaltem nè in aliquibus errare poſſet; præſertim in illis quæ docebat vel ſcribebat dum νέος & adhuc eſſet. Nam *Chriſtianus* & *Epiſcopus* ſimul factus eſt, imò *Epiſcopus* antequàm *Chriſtianus*, baptizatus utique inter *Electionem* & *Conſecrationem*. Jam verò liber iſte *De Viduis* videtur eſſe primus adeóque maximè immaturus tyrocinii ejus in *Theologia* fructus. Nam proximo poſt *Conſecrationem* anno (ut probat *Baronius* Tom. 4. 324. 327. ex ipſius *Ambroſii* verbis) ſcripſit Commentarios ſuos in *Lucam*; ex quibus etiam Commentariis aliquid, ſed non magni ponderis pro *Invocatione Sanctorum* habet, aut habere ſibi videtur *Bellarminus*. In his autem Commentariis mentionem facit libri ſui *De Viduis*, utpote anteà (in ipſo ſcilicet *Epiſcopatûs* & *Chriſtianitatis* ſuæ initio) ſcripti: unde illud *Auguſtini*, Ambroſius *vix Chriſtianus de rebus Eccleſiaſticis ſcribit*. Et profectò non mirum eſt, ſi *vix Chriſtianus vix Chriſtianè*, aut ſaltem non omninò nec in omnibus ſic ſcripſerit, ut veterem *Chriſtianum* & veteranum *Theologum* decebat ſcribere.

* *ſecundas cogitationes.*

Quare æquum eſt, ut hujuſmodi præſertim Authoris * δευτέρας φροντίδας meliores eſſe agnoſcamus, & ex poſterioribus potiùs quàm ex primis illius ſcriptis judicium ejus de re qualibet æſtimemus & colligamus. Quod ſi nos vel *Ambroſii* nomine à *Bellarmino* impetrare poſſumus, ſalva res eſt. Nam idem *Ambroſius* jam ſenior & in rebus Theologicis peritior & exercitator in illa *Oratione* quam habuit *De obitu Theodoſii Imp.* coram *Honorio Theodoſii* filio, inter alia præclarè dicta, in hunc modum Deum alloquitur, *TU SOLUS DOMINE INVOCANDUS ES, TU ROGANDUS ut eum*, (*Theodoſium* ſcilicet) *in filiis repræſentes*. En pulcherrimam † παλινῳδίαν!

† *recantationem.*

Non

Non jam dicit, obſecrandi ſunt *Angeli*, Invocandi ſunt *Martyres*; ſed *TV DOMINE*, inquit, *INVOCANDVS es*; & non præcipuè tantùm & ante alios quamvis unà cùm aliis; ſed *TV SOLVS Domine Invocandus es*, excluſis nimirùm omnibus aliis, tam *Angelis*, quàm *Martyribus*. Et ex hoc maturo & indubitato *Ambroſii* ſcripto, vera & genuina ejus de *Invocatione Sanctorum* ſententia (ſi in *Ambroſium* iniquiores eſſe nolumus) eſt colligenda.

HIERONYMI.

Pergamus itaque ad *Hieronymum*, quem proximum ex quarti ſæculi patribus pro *Invocatione Sanctorum* teſtem producit *Bellarminus*: ſed ex illo unicam tantùm ſententiolam & illam quidem per *Apoſtrophen* Rhetoricam ab *Hieronymo* dictam afferre potuit. Nam in Epitaphio *Paulæ* poetarum more ſcribens, *Vale*, inquit, *O* Paula, & *cultoris tui ultimam ſenectutem Orationibus juva.* Quod non ſic ab *Hieronymo* dictum ut ſe à *Paula* exauditum eſſe crederet, ex ipſo *Hieronymo* in Epitaphio *Nepotiani* oſtenditur: in quo quomodò in illo altero *Paulæ* Epitaphio ſe intelligi velit, clarè exprimit. Nam QUICQUID DIXERO, inquit, *quia ille non audit* (*Nepotianus* ſcilicet) *mutum videtur.* Et poſteà *CVM QVO LOQVI NON POSSVMVS, de eo loqui nunquam deſinamus.* Ex quibus conſtare mihi videtur, quòd quamvis *Hieronymus* (in loco à *Bellarmino* adducto) *Paulam* alloqui tanquam præſentem & audientem videatur, hoc tamen fecit more tantùm poetico (nam *Epitaphium* eſt res poetica) & non quòd cogitaverit *Paulam* illum de ſe aut ad ſe loquentem reverà audire: Quare ut ineptus fuiſſet *Hieronymus* non audientem ſeriò alloquendo, ſic ineptior multò fuiſſet non audientem ſeriò invocando. Nam quamvis non conſequens ſit *Sanctos* quia audiunt (ſi hoc verum eſſet) eſſe invocandos; tamen nihil eſt magis conſequens, quàm *Sanctos*, quia non audiunt, non eſſe invocandos. Et profectò ſi *Hieronymus* pro *Invocatione Sanctorum* cenſuiſſet, in illis quæ contra *Vigilantium* ſcripſit, illud apertè & clarè prodidiſſet. Nam cùm tria potiſſimùm tueretur *Vigilantius.*

1. *Martyres ſeu Sanctos defunctos non eſſe adorandos.*
2. *Neminem Mortuorum pro vivis intercedere.*
3. *Martyrum & Sanctorum animas non adeſſe ſuis tumulis, nec res viventium procurare.*

De duobus poſterioribus *Hieronymus* acriter & multo cum ſtomacho contra *Vigilantium* diſputat; de primo verò litem illi nullam movet; nam & ipſe *Martyrum* & *Sanctorum* animas adorandas eſſe negat. Et ſi per adorationem *Invocationem* non intellexerat, certè non amiſiſſet hanc tam idoneam occaſionem diſtinguendi inter *Sanctorum Adorationem* & *Invocationem*, priorem quidem illicitam, poſteriorem verò licitam eſſe aſſerendo; ſed neutiquam vel ibi vel alibi hoc fecit, facturus proculdubio ſi *Invocationem Sanctorum* ipſe probâſſet, & multò magis, ſi apud Eccleſiam iſtius temporis pro dogmate obtinuiſſet, aut in publico & communi uſu fuiſſet. Et hoc eſt quod in primo meo ad te ſcripto memini me aſſeruiſſe, cùm hujus ſuperſtitionis idololatricæ ſemina in ipſius *Auguſtini* ſæculo ſparſa eſſe & pullulare cœpiſſe ſic concederem, ut intereà tamen *Auguſtinum* ipſum in illo errore fuiſſe, aut tales invocandi Sanctorum formulas (quales in pſeudepigrapho illo *Meditationum* libro tu mihi oſtenderas) in *Auguſtini* temporis Eccleſia communiter receptas vel publicè uſurpatas eſſe, negaverim; quod etiam adhuc pernego.

AUGUSTINI. Et *Auguſtinum* ipſum quod attinet, ipſe fateris me ſatis ſolidè oſtendiſſe, iſtum, quem dixi, *Librum* ejus non eſſe. Sed quid refert, inquis, ſitne vel non? ſi eadem, quæ ibi, alibi apud *Auguſtinum* reperiantur? Non refert quidem, modò eadem in genuinis & indubitatis *Auguſtini* ſcriptis reperiri conſtet. Agè igitur expendamus illa, quæ ab illis, qui *Invocationem Sanctorum* defendunt, ex *Auguſtino* allegari dicis loca. Nam *Chryſoſtomo* & *Hieronymo* cum *Auguſtino* à te nominatis, & aliis etiam præcipuis quarti ſæculi Patribus, quos tu omittis, ſatis & ex abundanti, ut opinor, jam factum eſt.

I. *Primus* itaque *Auguſtini* locus à te *Pontificiorum* nomine allegatus, eſt ex lib. *De cognitione veræ vitæ*; qui etiam à *Lovani-*

Lovanienſibus Dial. 6. in eundem finem citatur. Sed quâ fide? cùm iidem ipſi *Lovanienſes* Cenſ. Tom. 9. dicant hoc opus non eſſe *Auguſtini*, ſtylum & alia quædam manifeſtare. Et *Eraſmus* in præfatiuncula iſti libro præfixa; *Non eſt opus*, inquit, *ut admoneam hoc opus non eſſe* Auguſtini; *ſtylus magis refert* Jovinianum *quempiam, ſeu febricitantem potiùs*; *Nam Cap. 6. dicit Angelos omnia ſcire & præſcire. Apparet eſſe progymnaſma Monachi tironis in Theologia.* Hæc *Eraſmus*. Et *Bellarminus* recenſet iſtum librum inter illos de quibus dicit ſe nihil certi habere, utpote cujus nec *Poſſidius* nec *Beda* in recenſendis *Auguſtini* operibus meminerunt.

* *Lib. de ſcript. Eccleſ. p.* 180.

II. Succedit in Catalogo tuo liber *De ſpiritu & anima*, priori non diſſimilis. Nam non eſſe *Auguſtini* ſatis conſtat, quia in Cap. 37. *Boëtius* allegatur, qui longo poſt *Auguſtinum* tempore natus eſt; ob quam rationem & alias à *Trithemio*, *Tho. Aquinate*, *Martino Delrio*, *Bellarmino* & aliis Pontificiis reprobatur.

III. Sequitur *tertius* locus ex lib. *De Baptiſ. contra Donat.* in cujus operis *lib. 7. cap. 6.* eſt reverà talis locus, & credo ejus generis eſſe unicum, qui citatur etiam à *Bellarmino*, ſed non ad probandum quòd *Sancti* ſunt *invocandi* à nobis (nam nihil ibi eſt hujuſmodi) ſed quòd Deum invocant pro nobis, hoc eſt, pro omnibus Eccleſiæ militantis membris in genere, quam ſuprà dixi eſſe ſententiam *Auguſtini*.

IV. *Quartus* eſt ex lib. *Quæſt. ſup. Exod.* & in illius quidem libri *quæſtione* (non 118. ſecundum catalogum à te poſitum ſed) 108. dicitur *Deus propitiari Sanctorum Orationibus*. Sed non nunc inter nos controvertitur an *ſancti* orent pro nobis, ſed an ſint à nobis invocandi; nec a poſitione prioris (ut ſæpiùs dixi) ſequitur poſterius.

V. Idem etiam dicendum eſt de *Auguſtini* (quas *quinto* loco commemoras) Enarrationibus in *Pſalm.* 85. & 88. In quibus nonnihil eſt de oratione *Sanctorum* pro nobis, ſed pro noſtra *Sanctorum Invocatione* planè nihil.

VI. Teſtimonium *ſextum* eſt ex *Sermone de Feſto Steph.* ſed utinam quemnam potiſſimùm Sermonem intelligeres

clariùs ſignificâſſes. Nam *ſeptem* ſunt *Sermones* de illo feſto, vel ab *Auguſtino* habiti, vel ſaltem *Auguſtino* attributi: Quorum tres, *primus* ſcilicet, *quintus*, & *ſextus*, non habent A majuſculum in capite præfixum, quam literam ſic poſitam *Eraſmus* monuit eſſe *Characteriſticam* ad denotandum legitimum *Auguſtini* partum. In *primo* autem horum *Sermonum* ſunt illa, ad quæ arbitror te reſpexiſſe, verba; nempè *Commendemus ergò nos orationibus ejus*: (1. *Stephani*) *multò enim magis nunc exauditur pro benè oratoribus*, ſive (ut eſt in margine) *veneratoribus ejus*, *qui ſic exauditus eſt tunc pro lapidatoribus ſuis.* Quæ quidem verba, ſi eſſent extra dubium *Auguſtini*, aliquid nobis negotii faceſſerent, ut illis ſatisfiat. Sed cùm hic *Sermo* non habeat in fronte illam quam dixi *Auguſtini* Characteriſticam, nec ut reliqui (qui ſunt genuini) nomen *Auguſtini* vel in ipſa *Lovanienſi* editione præfixum, non eſt quare quid in illo dictum vel non dictum ſit ſoliciti ſimus. Perlegi autem & *ſex* reliquos ejuſdem feſti *Sermones*, ſed in nullo illorum invenio aliquid hujus ſimile: ſub finem verò *ſecundi* (qui primus eſt characteriſticâ illâ literâ notatus) invenio *Auguſtinum* noſtrum, hoc eſt, verum, perorantem & dicentem, non ut ille *Pſeud-Auguſtinus Commendemus nos Orationibus*, *ſed Imitamini Conſervum*, *Imitamini Sanctum Stephanum*, *Imitamini omnes Sanctos Martyres. Homines erant*, *Conſervi tui erant.* En quam diverſus eſt hic ab illo altero de *Martyribus* & à nobis debitâ erga illos reverentiâ loquendi modus! Huc accedit quod in ejuſdem Feſti *Sermone quarto* (qui etiam eandem habet certitudinis ſuæ notam) de *Chriſto* dicit, quòd *orat pro nobis*, *orat in nobis*, *& oratur à nobis. Nam ut Sacerdos noſter*, inquit, *orat pro nobis*, *ut Caput noſtrum orat in nobis*, *& ut Deus noſter oratur à nobis.* Quibus verbis pulcherrimam (ut mihi videtur) innuit inter *Chriſtum* & alios omnes ſive *Sanctos*, ſive *Angelos* differentiam. Orare enim *pro nobis* poſſunt *Angeli*, poſſunt *Sancti*; ſed orare *in nobis* non poſſunt, orari *à nobis* non debent neque *Sancti* neque *Angeli.* Nam ut ſolus *Chriſtus orat in nobis*, quia ſolus & unicus eſt *Mediator*, ſic ſolus *Chriſtus* cum Patre & Spiritu ſancto *oratur à nobis*, quia ſolus & unicus eſt *Deus*.

Sep-

Septimò in diſquiſitionem venit *Sermo in feſto Petri & Pauli* habitus. Sed an *primus*, *ſecundus*, *tertius*, *quartus* vel *quintus* (nam totidem ſunt præter illum in *Vigilia feſti* pridianum) ex ſcripto tuo non conſtat: ſed credo te intelligere *primum* vel *quartum*, quia in cæteris nihil eſt de *Sanctorum* cultu vel invocatione. *Primus* verò citatur à *Bellarmino* pro religioſo cultu *Sanctorum*, & meritò quidem: Nam ibi diſertiſſimis verbis dicitur, quòd BEATISSIMUM PETRUM PISCATOREM, *modò provolutis genibus, adorat Gentium multitudo credentium per Jeſum Chriſtum Dominum noſtrum:* adeò ut ſecundum hunc *Auguſtinum* Sancti non ſolummodò ſint *honorandi* & venerandi, quod nos fatemur; imò nec ſolùm *invocandi*, quod nos negamus; ſed etiam *adorandi*, quod non putâram *Pontificios* ipſos eſſe conceſſuros; quamvis reverà *Sanctorum Invocatio*, pro qua contendunt, ſit ſpecies *adorationis*, quam Sanctis aſſerere non audent. Norunt enim illud *Hieronymi* contra *Vigilantium*; *NOS non dico Martyrum reliquias, ſed nè Solem quidem & Lunam, non Angelos, non Archangelos, non Cherubim & Seraphim, & omne nomen quod nominatur in præſenti ſæculo & futuro colimus & adoramus, nè ſerviamus creaturæ potiùs quàm Creatori.* Item, *QUIS Martyres aliquando adoravit? quis hominem putavit Deum?* Habeat igitur ſibi *Bellarminus* ſuum *Auguſtinum*, qui docet homines eſſe adorandos; imò qui non conſtituit *Petrum* Mediatorem inter nos & *Chriſtum*, ſed *Chriſtum* Mediatorem inter nos & *Petrum:* nam non dicit quòd *Deum patrem*, ſed quod *Piſcatorem* Petrum *adorat multitudo Gentium credentium per Jeſum Chriſtum.* Verba enim illa [*PER JESUM CHRISTUM*] referri videntur ad [*ADORAT*] non ad [*CREDENTIUM.*] Nam credere dicimur *Chriſto* aut *in Chriſtum*, ſed non dicimur credere *per Chriſtum.* Quare horum verborum ſenſus eſt, quòd *multitudo credentium adorat* Petrum *Piſcatorem per Jeſum Chriſtum*; adeò ut in hac ſententia ſic intellecta duplex ſit Blaſphemia, in *Deum* ſcilicet & in *Chriſtum*; & quomodocunque intelligitur aut conſtruitur, Blaſphemiam continet in *Deum*, cùm alium præter Deum proponat humano generi & gentibus in Chriſtum,

ſtum, ſive (ut ille loquitur) per Chriſtum credentibus adorandum. Nos autem non ſic didicimus *Chriſtum*, neque ab ipſo *Chriſto*, neque ab *Apoſtolis*, neque à noſtro *Auguſtino*, qui in libro de Paſtoribus; *ANGELUS*, inquit, *multa & mira oſtendens homini, ab homine adorabatur.* — *At ille à ſe revocans ad Dominum, Noli*, inquit, *facere*; *ILLUM ADORA*; *Nam ego CONSERVUS tuus ſum, & fratrum tuorum.* Itaque ſecundum verum *Auguſtinum*, nullus Conſervorum noſtrorum ſive *Sanctus* ſive *Angelus* eſt adorandus. Quare hic *primus* de *Petro* & *Paulo* Sermo non eſt *Auguſtini*; quod etiam obſervarunt *Eraſmus* & *Lovanienſes*; nam neque in ejus editione habet literam Characteriſticam A, nec in illorum appoſitum *Auguſtini* nomen.

Apoc. 22.

VIII. Et propter eundem defectum idem dici poteſt de *Sermone quarto*, quamvis non videam quid ſequeretur incommodi, ſi concederemus illum eſſe genuinum. Nam cum duo tantùm ex illo *Sermone* citentur aut citari poſſint loca, quorum unus eſt [*NUNC ad Memoriam piſcatoris flectuntur genua Imperatoris*] alter [*VENEREMUR itaque principes gregis noſtri, ſi volumus caulas intrare Paſtoris*] ex neutro infertur *Sanctorum Invocatio*; nam aliud eſt *Veneratio*, aliud *Invocatio*; Item aliud eſt ad Memorias *Martyrum* genua flectere, aliud verò ipſos orare *Martyres*. Nam ſexcentis *Auguſtini* & aliorum Patrum teſtimoniis oſtendi poteſt veteres, cum orarent *ad Memorias Martyrum*, non ipſos Martyres, ſed Deum invocâſſe. Et nè quis *Gentilium* aut *Novitiorum* inter *Chriſtianos* nondum ſatis aut ritè inſtitutus ſuſpicaretur *Martyres* à Chriſtianis vel *adorari*, quia ad eorum *Memorias* Deus adorabatur; vel *invocari* quoniam inter ſacrificandum & orandum illorum nomina recenſebantur; *Nominantur reverà*, inquit *Auguſtinus*, *ſed non Invocantur: De Civit. Dei* lib. 22. cap. 10. Quid clarius? quid ad finalem hujus cauſæ deciſionem (ſi ex *Auguſtino* aut per *Auguſtinum* decidenda eſt) plenius & efficacius? Sed videamus quæ ſuperſunt.

IX. Proximus locus à te notatus eſt ex *lib.* 22. *De Civit. Dei cap.* 29. volebas credo ſcripſiſſe *cap.* 9. nam in *cap.* 29. nihil

nihil eſt vel pro, vel contra *Sanctorum Invocationem.* In *nono* vero *cap.* nonnihil habetur de iis quæ per *Martyres* pro nobis fieri dicuntur; ſed ſive illa fiant eis orantibus tantùm & impetrantibus, ſive etiam operantibus, in dubio relinquit; de *Invocatione* verò nihil dicit.

X. Neque etiam in libro ſecundo contra *Fauſtum Manichæum*; cujus libri (quem integrum evolvi) ſunt *ſex* tantùm *Capita*; tu verò *viceſimum primum* indigitaſti. Sed in *Capite* 21. *lib.* 21. contra *Fauſtum* (qui eſt ultimus Topicorum tuorum ex *Auguſtino*) dicitur *Martyres coli quidem à nobis, ſed eo cultu dilectionis & ſocietatis, quo & in hac vita coluntur ſancti homines Dei*: quem nemo opinor dixerit eſſe cultum *Invocationis*, de qua ſola præſens eſt diſquiſitio.

Et ſic ut opinor (*Mi ULITI*) ſatisfactum eſt omnibus, quæ à te *Pontificiorum* nomine pro *Invocatione Sanctorum* ex *Auguſtino* allegantur, teſtimoniis. Sed quia *Auguſtinus* non modò ab his, ſed ab omnibus, quæ ex ipſo contra ipſum proferri ſolent, objectionibus eſt vindicandus; & quia *Bellarminus* fateri videtur illa omnia ex *Auguſtino* à te prolata, eſſe minùs idonea vel minùs efficacia, cùm nullius illorum ipſe meminerit; videamus an magìs accommodata & magìs valida ſint illa, quæ *Bellarminus* ipſe, ex eodem *Auguſtino*, quamvis non ex iiſdem locis, producit. Duo autem priora (nam *tria* tantùm ſunt loca) non ſunt hujus diſquiſitionis propria.

Loca Auguſtini *à* Bellarmino *adducta.*

I. Nam *primi* (qui ex *Tract.* 84. *in Johannem* deſumitur) hæc ſunt verba. *IDEO quippè ad ipſam menſam non ſic eos* (Martyres) *commemoramus, quemadmodum alios qui in pace requieſcunt, ut etiam pro iis oremus, ſed magìs ut ipſi pro nobis orent.*] Ubi primùm obiter advertendum, quòd *Defuncti*, pro quibus Eccleſia tunc temporis orabat, *requieſcebant in pace*; & proinde *Oratio pro Defunctis* in veteri Eccleſia non ponebat aut ſupponebat *Purgatorium.* Deinde locum ipſum quod attinet, quicquid ex illo colligi poteſt, illud omne ad

Sancto-

Sanctorum pro nobis *Interceſſionem*, non ad illorum à nobis *Invocationem* pertinet. Nam quod hic dicit [*Commemoramus*] idem eſt cum illo quod alibi dixerat [*Nominamus*] ideoque ut [*Nominamus*] illic, ſic [*Commemoramus*] hîc contradiſtingui debet ab [*Invocamus.*]

II. Ad *ſecundum Bellarmini* ex *Auguſtino* Teſtimonium idem eſt dicendum: quòd ſcilicet in his verbis [*Injuria eſt pro Martyre orare, cujus nos debemus orationibus commendari*] *Auguſtinus* non loquitur de noſtra *Martyrum Invocatione*, ſed de *Martyrum* pro nobis *Interceſſione* tantúm.

III. *Tertius* verò, qui ſequitur in *Bellarmino* ex *Auguſtino* locus, ſi ſeorſum à contextu & per ſe conſideretur, talis eſt, ut incautum & negligentem lectorem facilè decipiat, adeò ut *Auguſtinum* ſecus quàm ſenſerit, ſenſiſſe credat. Verba autem apud *Bellarminum* hæc ſunt. [*Non video quòd ſit adjumentum mortuorum proviſus ſepeliendis corporibus apud memorias Sanctorum locus, niſi ad hoc, ut dum recolant, ubi ſunt repoſita eorum, quos diligunt, corpora; iiſdem ſanctis illos tanquam Patronis ſuſceptos, apud Dominum adjuvandos orando commendent.*] Hæc ſunt, inquam, à *Bellarmino* (ex libro *De cura pro mortuis gerenda*) citata, quæ, ut verum apud te non diſſimulem, primâ facie aliquantulum me moverunt. Quare cùm fidem *Jeſuiticam* non ignorarem, *Auguſtinum* ipſum ſtatìm conſului, totúmque contextum, imò integrum librum legi & relegi. Et primùm animadverto, disjuncta eſſe in *Auguſtino*, quæ conjuncta ſunt in *Bellarmino*. Nam cùm in præcedentibus *Auguſtinus* de Sepulturæ cauſa atque ratione ſententiam ſuam expoſuerat, ſubjicit [*Quod ſi verum eſt, profectò etiam proviſus ſepeliendis corporibus apud Memorias Sanctorum locus bonæ affectionis humanæ eſt erga funera ſuorum; quoniam ſi nonnulla religio eſt ut ſepeliantur, non poteſt nulla eſſe quando ubi ſepeliantur attenditur. Sed cùm talia vivorum ſolatia requirantur, quibus pius in ſuos animus appareat, non video quæ ſunt adjumenta Mortuorum.* Tum poſt colon ſeu dimidiatam periodum ſequitur; *Niſi ad hoc, ut dum recolant ubi ſunt poſita eorum, quos diligunt corpora, iiſdem Sanctis illos tanquam Patronis ſuſceptos, apud Deum adjuvandos*

dos orando commendent.] Et hic quidem eſt integer apud ipſum *Auguſtinum* locus; qui in hoc differt ab illo *Bellarminiano*, quòd ex textu ipſo ſepultura mortuorum ad memorias Sanctorum magis *ad vivorum ſolatium* quàm *ad mortuorum adjumentum* pertinere dicitur; ſed ut recitatur à *Bellarmino*, adjumentum mortuorum ſolummodò ex tali ſepultura quæri videtur. Et reverà à quibuſdam illius temporis magnum inde mortuis compendium ſperabatur, quaſi *Martyres* apud ſe depoſitos majori curâ amplecterentur, utpote quò non tantùm preces apud Memorias ſuas factas exaudire, ſed cum pro defunctis precantibus comprecari crederentur. Sed cùm ex multis alibi paſſim, atque etiam in hoc ipſo libro locis manifeſtiſſimum ſit *Auguſtinum* in illa ſententia non fuiſſe, fateri oportet vel quòd *Auguſtinus* ſibi ipſi in uno eodémque paucarum paginarum libello apertè contradixerit, vel quòd non idem ſit horum verborum ſenſus *Auguſtino* & *Bellarmino*. Imò non poſſum non ſuſpicari *Bellarminum* conſcium ſibi eſſe, quòd his *Auguſtini* verbis contra *Auguſtini* mentem abuſus fuerit: aliàs certè etiam hîc exclamâſſet, *Quid clarius?* ut ſuprà exclamavit, ad illum ænigmaticum *Irenæi* locum. Non latuit itaque *Bellarminum*, diverſum à ſono ſenſum in his verbis eſſe; ſed ſperavit minùs attentos lectores, præſertim ſi *Auguſtinum* ipſum non conſulerent, illa, prout ſonare videntur, intellecturos. Nam qui attentè legerit integrum illum *de Cura pro Mortuis gerenda* libellum (ex quo hæc verba deſumuntur) clarè perſpiciet *Auguſtinum* alieniſſimum eſſe ab illa opinione, quam illi ex his verbis nec fideliter recitatis nec candidè intellectis affingere conatur *Bellarminus*.

1. Ad locum itaque ipſum reſpondeo, *primùm* quòd *Auguſtinus* non ex ſua ſed ex aliorum ſententia hîc loqui videtur; cùm ille & alibi & in hoc ipſo libro ſæpiùs affirmet nullam mortuis rerum hujus vitæ vel curam vel cognitionem eſſe particularem: ſed quia novit *Hieronymum* & alios magni nominis viros aliter ſentire, idcirco cùm in prima parte hujus periodi ex ſua ipſius ſententia dixiſſet ſe non videre quid adjumenti eſſet mortuis ad memorias Martyrum ſepeliri,

liri, ex aliorum ſententia ſubjungit quæ ſequuntur; ídque non per modum affirmantis, ſed dubitantis, aut aliquid aliorum gratiâ ſupponentis & quaſi concedentis. Nam qui dicit ſe non videre *quid adjumenti ſit mortuis* ſic ſepeliri, *niſi ad hoc*, non affirmat aliquid illis adjumenti inde eſſe vel *ad hoc*: ſed potiùs ſi non ſit utile *ad hoc*, quòd ſit prorſus inutile. Et hæc reverà fuit Opinio *Auguſtini* de ſepultura Mortuorum *ad Memorias Sanctorum*, nempè, quòd quamvis providere talem ſepeliendis mortuis locum *bonæ affectionis humanæ in funera ſuorum* argumentum ſit, & prætereà quod *vivis* inde aliquod *ſolatium* eſſe poſſet; tamen nullum omninò eſſe *mortuis* ipſis inde *adjumentum*: niſi fortaſſe illud verum ſit quod alii ſentiunt, *Martyribus* ſcilicet illos, qui ad *Memorias* ipſorum ſepeliuntur, magìs curæ eſſe quàm alios; ſiquidem *illos iiſdem Martyribus tanquam Patronis, apud Deum adjuvandos orando commendemus: quod tamen*, inquit, *fieri poteſt, etiamſi in talibus locis humari non poſſint.* Quibus verbis perſtringere videtur illam opinionem de particulari *Martyrum*, pro illis qui apud *Memorias* illorum ſepeliuntur, curâ; & prætereà ſuam ipſius ſententiam iterum non obſcurè ſignificat, *Martyres* ſcilicet ex æquo apud Deum intercedere pro omnibus, qui illis apud Deum adjuvandi orando commendentur.

2. Unde patet altera reſponſio ad hunc *Auguſtini* locum, & illa quidem ad ipſa hujus loci verba magìs accommodata; nempè quòd *ſepulti ad Memorias Martyrum ab iiſdem Martyribus adjuvantur apud Deum*; non quòd ibi ſepeliuntur, ſed quòd *illis* Deum *orando commendantur*; Martyribus, inquam, commendantur orando, ſed *Deum* orando non *Martyres*. Nam etiam illi ipſi, qui tunc temporis *Martyribus* & *Sanctis* defunctis particularem illarum rerum, quæ hic aguntur, cognitionem & curam attribuebant, non tamen illos ipſos *Martyres* aut *Sanctos*, ſed Deum orando, ſe & alios illorum patrocinio commendabant: ſicut nos etiam orare Deum ſolemus, ut aliorum viventium orationes pro nobis exaudire velit. Adeò ut ex hoc loco, ſive in *Auguſtini*, ſive in *Hieronymi* ſenſu, intellecto, *Sanctorum Invocatio* evinci non poſſit: ſed ſolummodò, quòd *Sancti* illos *apud Deum adjuvant*, qui illorum

illorum patrocinio Deum *orando commendantur*. Nam dato, non conceſſo, quòd ſicut *Angeli*, ſic etiam *Sancti* curam noſtri & noſtrarum rerum à Deo illis demandatam habeant; cùm tamen à Deo demandatam illam provinciam non pro ſua ſed pro Dei voluntate exerceant, & religioni & rationi magis conſentaneum eſt, ut à Miniſtrorum Domino potiùs quàm ab ipſis Miniſtris, iſtiuſmodi miniſterii beneficium (quicquid illud ſit aut eſſe poſſit) & petamus & expectemus. Nam proculdubio *orare Deum* licet mandare *Angelis* ſuis, ut cuſtodiant nos in omnibus viis noſtris; ſed non idcirco licet *orare Angelos*, ut illi nos in viis noſtris **cuſtodire** velint; nec vetus Eccleſia *ante Chriſtum* (quamvis *Angelos* ſcirent *Dei Miniſtros* eſſe *pro bono noſtro*) unquam ſic oravit; & vetus Eccleſia *poſt Chriſtum* in ſynodo *Laodicena*, ſic orantes damnavit. Et quod concludit contra *Invocationem Angelorum*, concludit à fortiori contra *Invocationem Martyrum* & *Sanctorum*.

Hæc autem, uti ſpero, ſufficiunt ad vindicandum non tantùm *Auguſtinum*, ſed etiam reliquos omnes *quarti ſæculi* Patres, tam *Græcos* quàm *Latinos* (exceptis tribus aut quatuor, ubi non *Dogmaticè* ſed vel *Rhetoricè* vel *Poeticè* loquuntur) ab illa infamiæ nota, quam illis inurere conantur *Pontificii*, dum illos pro hodierna *Eccleſiæ Romanæ* Idololatria teſtimonium, velint nécne, cogunt dicere. Et profectò **ſi non** omnem exuiſſent frontem, omnem, *Auguſtini* præcipue, mentionem hac in cauſa omiſiſſent, quem probè norunt *Invocationem Sanctorum* adeò non probâſſe, ut non modò rem ipſam diſertis verbis neget, cùm dicat, (quod antea obſervatum eſt) *in ſacris Eccleſiæ conventibus & myſteriis Sanctos nominari quidem, ſed non Invocari*; ſed ipſa hujus tam pravæ ſuperſtitionis fundamenta, quàm primùm jacta fuerint, aperte & de induſtria convellat. Nam non negabunt *Pontificii* fundamentum *Invocationis Sanctorum* eſſe perſuaſionem quandam (ſive veram ſive falſam) quòd *Sancti* defuncti rebus humanis adhuc interſint, & preces illorum, qui illos invocant, exaudiant, aut aliquo ſaltem modo, quid ab illis petatur, intelligant. Sed *Auguſtinus*, quamvis concedat *Sanctos*

orare quidem pro nobis in genere (utpote quos, propriâ experientiâ edocti, ſciunt ſub Cruce militare & multis magniſque difficultatibus & periculis obnoxios eſſe) tamen (ut antea dixi) adeò non concedit illos orationes noſtras exaudire, ut clarè & aſſeveranter & ſæpiùs affirmet, *Ibi eſſe defunctorum ſpiritus, ubi non vident quæcunque aguntur aut eveniunt in iſta vita hominibus. Et quomodò ergo*, inquit, *tumulos ſuos aut corpora ſua, utrùm abjecta jaceant, an ſepulta?* Et ſi, *tumulos* habeant nécne, neſciant, quomodò, inquam ego, preces & ſupplicationes, quæ apud tumulos eorum fiunt, exaudient? Noverat quidem *Auguſtinus* (ut ſuprà monui) quoſdam ſui temporis magnos & pios viros aliter ſenſiſſe, *Sanctos* ſcilicet vitâ functos non orare tantùm pro omnibus in genere; ſed pro aliquibus impenſiùs quàm pro aliis in particulari, & præterea precibus orantium intereſſe, illáſque audire & Deo commendare, quamvis nondum eò uſque progrederentur, ut vel ipſi *Sanctos* invocarent, vel invocandos eſſe affirmarent. Sed quia prævidit *Auguſtinus* ex hoc falſo fundamento, & ex hoc quod jam fieri videbat, illud brevi futurum eſſe quod nondum faciebant, idcirco quamvis *authores* ipſos nominatim non perſtringat, contra has tamen tam periculoſas eorum *opiniones* (per totum ferè illum *De cura pro mortuis gerenda* librum) acriter & ſolidè diſputat. *Nam ut volet*, inquit, *accipiat quiſque quod dicam: ſi rebus viventium intereſſent animæ mortuorum, meipſum pia Mater mea nullâ nocte deſereret, quæ terrâ marique ſecuta eſt ut mecum viveret. Sed certè, quod ſacer Pſalmus perſonat, verum eſt*; Quoniam Pater meus & Mater mea dereliquerunt me, Dominus autem aſſumpſit me. *Si ergo dereliquerunt nos Patres noſtri, quomodò noſtris curis & rebus interſunt? ſi autem Parentes non interſunt, qui ſunt alii mortuorum, qui norunt quid agamus quidve patiamur?* Et paulò poſt; *Quomodò dicemus*, inquit, *eis fuiſſe conſultum, qui obierunt antequàm venirent mala, ſi & poſt mortem ſentiant, quæcunque in vitæ humanæ calamitate contingunt? Quare piiſſimo regi* Joſiæ *pro magno beneficio promiſit Deus*, Ecce ego apponam te ad Patres tuos, & apponêris.

Lib. de Cura pro mortuis gerenda.

ponêris in pace, & non videbunt oculi tui omnia mala, quæ ego induco in locum hunc & qui commorantur in eo. Hæc omnia ibi *Auguſtinus*, ex quibus tandem infert illam, quam dixi, Concluſionem. *Ibi ergo ſunt ſpiritus defunctorum, ubi non vident quæcunque aguntur aut eveniunt in iſta vita hominibus.* Cujus Concluſionis hoc eſt Conſectarium, aut non credidiſſe *Auguſtinum* Sanctos eſſe invocandos (quod verum eſt & *Auguſtino* dignum) aut credidiſſe illos eſſe invocandos, qui nihil illorum quæ agerentur aut dicerentur, aut cogitarentur, aut viderent, aut audirent, aut intelligerent: quod non modò falſum eſt & abſurdum, ſed ſtolidum & inſanum, adeóque de tali, qualis *Auguſtinus* fuit, viro prorſus incredibile.

Jam verò quamvis tam multa & tam clara pro *Auguſtino* ex ipſo *Auguſtino* teſtimonia ſatìs ſupérque illum vindicent ab hujus erroris ſuſpicione: unus tamen inſuper locus eſt, íſque tam illuſtris, támque ad omnimodam *Sanctorum Invocationem* tollendam accommodatus, ut illum omittere non poſſim. Solent (ut nôſti) *Pontificii*, cùm S. *Scripturarum* & *Patrum* teſtimoniis aliter reſpondere non poſſint, diſtinguere (ut ſuperiùs dixi) inter *Invocationem ſummam, directam* & *abſolutam*, & *Invocationem ſubalternam, indirectam* & *relativam*: & *illam* quidem ſoli Deo debitam eſſe dicunt, & de illa intelligi debere Scripturas & Patres, quando vel pro ſolius Dei Invocatione, aut contra *Sanctorum Invocationem* loqui videntur; *hanc* verò, *ſubalternam* ſcilicet, *indirectam* & *relativam invocationem* (quâ nimirum quis invocat unum, ut apud alium pro illo intercedat) poſſe & debere *Angelis* etiam & *Sanctis* exhiberi. Regerentibus autem nobis, quòd hoc nihil aliud eſt, quàm *Angelos* & *Sanctos* tanquam *Mediatores* inter Deum & homines conſtituere, cùm *Paulus* diſertiſſimis verbis, ut *unum Deum*, ſic *unum Mediatorem inter Deum & homines*, Ἄνθρωπον ſcilicet *Chriſtum*, agnoſcat: hîc iterum diſtinguunt *Pontificii* inter *Mediatorem Redemptionis* & *Mediatorem Interceſſionis*; & *Redemptionis* quidem unicum, *Interceſſionis* verò plures Mediatores eſſe aſſerunt.

Videamus itaque an ſic, vel ſecus ſenſerit *Auguſtinus*; qui contra *Parmenianum lib.* 2. *cap.* 8. repetens illa Sancti *Johan-*

nis verba (1 *Joh.* 2.) *Fratres, hoc ſcribo vobis, ut non peccetis; & ſi quis peccaverit, Advocatum habemus apud Patrem, Jeſum Chriſtum juſtum*; Statim ſubjicit: *Si verò diceret, Hoc ſcripſi vobis ut non peccetis, & ſi quis peccaverit, Mediatorem me habetis apud Patrem, & ego exoro pro peccatis veſtris,* (*ſicut* Parmenianus *quodam loco Mediatorem poſuit Epiſcopum inter populum & Deum*) *quis eum ferret bonorum & fidelium Chriſtianorum? quis ſicut Apoſtolum Chriſti, & non ſicut Antichriſtum intueretur? Homines enim omnes Chriſtiani invicem ſe commendant orationibus ſuis: pro quo autem nullus interpellat, ſed ipſe pro omnibus, hic unus verúſque Mediator eſt.* Paulus *autem Apoſtolus, quanquam ſub capite præcipuum membrum, ſe orationibus fidelium & ipſe commendat: nec Mediatorem ſe facit inter populum & Deum. — Nam ſi eſſet Mediator* Paulus, *utique & cæteri Co-apoſtoli ejus; nec ipſi* Paulo *conſtaret ratio qui dixerat*, Unus enim Deus, unus Mediator Dei & hominum homo Chriſtus Jeſus. Hæc ibi *Auguſtinus:* ubi de *Chriſto Mediatore* (non quatenus Mediator eſt *Redemptionis* tantùm, ſed quatenus eſt Mediator *Interceſſionis* etiam) de *Chriſto*, inquam, *Mediatore Interceſſionis*, ſeu de tali Mediatore, qui orandus eſt ut Deum oret & interpellet pro nobis, apertè loquitur; & tamen concludit ex *S. Johanne* & *S. Paulo*, non plures ſed unum & unicum vel in hoc ſenſu eſſe *Mediatorem.* Et hinc eſt quòd in illa Epiſtola, quam (rogatus à *Proba* vidua, *Quomodò Deum orare deberet*) ad illam *de Oratione & orandi modo* ſcripſit, nullam omninò de *Angelorum* aut *Sanctorum Invocatione* mentionem facit, ſed *Dominicam Orationem* tanquam orandi normam & regulam proponit. *Nam quamlibet alia*, inquit, *verba dicamus, quæ affectus orantis vel præcedendo format ut clareat* (legendum puto, *ut caleat*) *vel conſequendo attendit ut creſcat, nihil aliud dicimus, quàm quòd in iſta Dominica Oratione poſitum eſt, ſi rectè & congruenter oramus.* Sed nihil eſt in iſta oratione de *Invocatione Sanctorum*, aut de Invocatione Dei *per Sanctos.* Sed neque de Invocatione Dei *per Chriſtum*, inquies. Imò certè: nam quomodò aut Deum adire, aut ut patrem alloqui quis poſſit, niſi *in* & *per Chriſtum?* Et quod

hîc

hîc docet nos *Chriſtus* implicitè, alibi nos docuit clarè & apertè, ut *Joh.* 14. 13. & 15, 16. ubi promiſit ſe effecturum quicquid vel *ab ipſo*, vel *à Patre ipſius nomine* petituri ſumus. Quibus verbis docemur & *Chriſtum* ipſum invocare ut Deum; & Deum invocare *per Chriſtum* tanquam per *Mediatorem*. Sed nullibi docemur aut *Sanctos* ipſos invocare, aut Deum invocare *per Sanctos*. Quod ſi vel neceſſarium eſſet, vel utile, certè nec *Chriſtus*, cùm orandi formulam Diſcipulis ſuis traderet, illud omiſiſſet; nec *Paulus*, qui profitetur (*Act.* 20. 20.) nihil utilium ſe ſubtraxiſſe, quod non publicè docuerit, hoc neglexiſſet; nec *Auguſtinus* denique, cùm erudiret *Probam* viduam, quomodò maximo cum fructu Deum oraret, hoc illam celâſſet.

Imò nec ipſe Cardinalis *Peronius Caſaubono* dixiſſet; *Se nunquam in omni ſua vita (præterquàm cùm in publicis proceſſionibus ſuccamaret cum cæteris* Ora pro nobis) *aliquem Sanctorum invocâſſe*: Quod tamen de *Peronio* ex ipſius *Caſauboni* (viri fide digni) relatione, ſcribit Vir fide digniſſimus paritérque doctiſſimus, & antiquis moribus Præſul, Epiſcopus noſter * *Andreas Wintonienſis*. Vide igitur quàm magna vis ſit veritatis, quæ etiam à profeſſis illius Adverſariis confeſſionem aliquando extorquet. Nam quis ex omnibus *Pontificiis* fortior, & (ut apud ſuos prædicatur) felicior *Invocationis Sanctorum* Propugnator extitit quàm Cardinalis *Peronius*? qui *Invocationem* iſtam, ſi non ut omninò neceſſariam, tamen ut utiliſſimam & ab omnibus, qui pro *Catholicis* cenſeri volunt, uſurpandam, contra *JACOBUM* Regem noſtrum aſſerit & tuetur? Et tamen ille ipſe *Peronius* faſſus eſt ſe nunquam aliquem *Sanctorum*, niſi *pro forma*, & nè ſcandalum aliis daret, invocâſſe. Quâ itaque conſcientiâ rem, quam credebat utiliſſimam, ipſe neglexit? aut quâ fide rem, quam putabat inutilem, tam acriter defendit, & aliis tanquam rem utiliſſimam prædicat & commendat? Illâ ipsâ nempè fide & conſcientiâ, quâ alter magnus Cardinalis (*Bellarminus* ſcilicet) per quatuor integros libros & maximam partem quinti

Card. PERONII *Confeſſio.*

* *vide ejus opuſcula poſthuma.*

BELLARMINI *ſimilis Confeſſio.*

quinti prolixè diſputat pro *Juſtitia inhærente* & *Meritis operum*, ac ſi adeò perfecta eſſent aut eſſe poſſent, ut ex illis perfectè juſtificari, & illis innixi coram ipſius Dei Tribunali in diſtricto ejus judicio ſecurè comparere poſſimus. Et tamen poſt tam prolixam diſputationem tandem concludit, Quòd *Propter incertitudinem propriæ juſtitiæ, & periculum inanis gloriæ, Tutiſſimum eſt fiduciam totam in Sola Dei miſericordia & benignitate reponere.* Quod quid eſt aliud quam fateri, quòd in tota præcedenti diſputatione, contra certiſſimam & tutiſſimam ad æternam ſalutem viam, pro incerta & periculoſa, prudens & ſciens contenderat? Et certè iiſdem ferè verbis *Peronius* etiam in ſua ad *Caſaubonum* Confeſſione, ſi non uſus eſt, uti debuerat; nempè, quòd propter incertitudinem Sanctorum (reſpectu illarum rerum quæ hîc fiunt) cognitionis, & propter periculum Idololatriæ in Sanctis Invocandis, tutiſſimum eſt ſolum Deum per ſolum Chriſtum invocare.

De Juſtific. lib. 5. cap. 7.

Invocatio Sanctorum quando cœperit in Eccleſia.

Et hoc veterem Eccleſiam feciſſe uſque ad *quartum ſæculum* ferè eſt in confeſſo. Nam *Pereſius tertia part. de Tradit.* fatetur à tempore *Cornelii*, (hoc eſt, poſt an. 250.) *Interceſſiones Sanctorum ſcriptis fuiſſe commendatas*; & à tempore *Baſilii* (hoc eſt, circa an. 370.) *Invocationes.* Unde obiter advertendum, quòd ab *Interceſſione Sanctorum* ad illorum *Invocationem* non valet argumentum, cùm ſecundum *Pereſii* calculum Opinio de *Interceſſione* præceſſerit Opinionem de *Invocatione* centum & viginti annis. Sin dicat *Pereſius* utramque ſimul & ſemper fuiſſe in Eccleſia, quamvis altera priùs, altera poſteriùs ſcriptis commendaretur; primùm ab illo quæro, quomodò conſtat aut conſtare poteſt aliquam opinionem vel praxim tot retrò ſæculis ſemper fuiſſe in Eccleſia, cujus nè unus quidem tot Eccleſiaſticorum Scriptorum ante *Cornelii* & *Baſilii* tempora meminit, aut in ſcriptis ſuis mentionem ullam fecit? Deinde à *Pereſio* iterum quæro, ſi utraque vel alterutra harum opinionum fuiſſet ab initio in Eccleſia, tanquam ab Apoſtolis per Apoſtolicos viros tradita & de-

& derivata, quomodò fieri potuit ut illi Veterum vetuſtiſſimi (quos antea à *Sixto Senenſi* nominavi) animas defunctorum non in cœlo, ſed in tali loco eſſe crederent, ubi nec invocantium preces audire, nec apud Deum intercedere poterant, utpote qui nondum erant, nec ante conſummationem ſæculi futuri erant Beatificæ viſionis ipſi compotes. Prior itaque irrepſit in Eccleſiam (authore ejus *Origene*) opinio de *Martyrum* apud Deum *Interceſſione* circa medium *tertii ſæculi:* & poſteà verſus finem *quarti ſæculi* eorundem *Martyrum* à quibuſdam *Invocatio*, (ab Oratoribus & Poetis initio primùm facto;) ſed non ſine magna clariſſimorum in illo & ſequenti ſæculo virorum oppoſitione, *Epiphanii* præſertim & *Auguſtini*, itémque *Ambroſii*, *Hieronymi*, *Chryſoſtomi* & *Theodoreti:* adeò ut non ante *ſextum* à Chriſto *ſæculum* obtinuerit, ut in publicum Eccleſiæ uſum reciperetur. Et tum demum à *Gregorio Magno* Pont. Rom. *Invocatio Sanctorum* publicis Eccleſiæ Litaniis addita & inſerta: ſed non adhuc talis, qualem nunc videmus. Nam quantumvis inter diſputandum dicant *Pontificii* ſe *Sanctos* invocando nihil aliud intelligere, quàm ut *Sancti* pro illis Deum orarent: tamen ex uſu communi, ex publicarum privatarúmque precum formulis typis excuſis, & ex picturis & imaginibus quas *Laicorum libros* appellant, paſſim & palam eſt videre, quòd aliam in ſinu fovent opinionem, aut ſaltem quòd aliter à vulgo credi volunt; *Sanctos* ſcilicet invocandos eſſe, non ut *Interceſſores* tantùm, ſed ut datores & largitores bonorum omnium: quæ quidem à *Sanctis*, & præcipuè à B. *Virgine* ſæpiùs & fidentiùs peti ſolent, quàm ab ipſo *Deo* vel *Chriſto*.

Et quidni plebs ignara & rudis hoc faceret? Cùm *Gabriel Biel* magni nominis Scholaſticus, *Canonem Miſſæ* exponens lect. 8. ſic ſcribat; *Pater cæleſtis dimidium regni ſui Beatiſſimæ Virgini conceſſit (quod in* Eſthere *præfiguratum fuit cui* Aſſuerus *dimidium regni ſui permiſit.) Cùm enim duo ſint cæleſtis regni bona principalia, Juſtitia ſcilicet & Miſericordia, Juſtitiam ſibi reſervavit, Virgini* Mariæ *conceſſit Miſericordiam.* Et *Bernardinus* in libro, quem inſcribit *Mariale*, [*Provocare*, inquit, *oportet à Tribunali Juſtitiæ di-*

vinæ ad Tribunal Miſericordiæ Virginis Mariæ.

Et quod fingendo docent in *Scriptis*, pingendo oſtentant in *Imaginibus*. Vidi enim ego ipſe in Cœnobio *Franciſcanorum*, quod eſt *Antwerpiæ*, itémque in altero Cœnobio eorundem Fratrum quod eſt *Brugis*, Tabellam eleganter depictam & omnium oculis expoſitam: in qua ex una parte ſtat *Chriſtus*, ex altera *Virgo* Mater. *Chriſtus* erectus in pedes pingitur, torvo & terribili vultu minax, & exertâ dextrâ flammatum & triſulcum fulmen vibrans, quaſi jamjam orbem terrarum perditurus, & de miſeris mortalibus ultimum ſupplicium ſumpturus, ni filio infenſo præſtò adeſſet magìs miſericors *Mater*, & filii dextram apprehendens, furoris ejus impetum in ipſo conatu & curſu ſiſteret; exorata nimirum à *Dominico* & *Franciſco*, qui ad imam tabellæ partem genibus flexis, oculíſque & manibus non ad *Chriſtum* ſed ad *Mariam* elevatis & extenſis invocare illam videntur, ut filio ſuo jure Matris imperaret (ſic enim loqui ſolent) nè genus humanum iratus perderet. En lepidam, nec mutam ſed loquentem, imò eloquentem *Laicorum Magiſtram!* quâ efficaciùs, quàm ullis verbis poſſunt, admonentur *Mariam* potiùs quàm *Chriſtum*, matrem potiùs quàm filium invocandam eſſe; utpote quæ viſcerum plenior, & peccatoribus indulgentior, & ad miſeris ſuccurrendum pronior & promptior ſit quàm *Chriſtus*. Et dolendum quidem eſt quòd huic tam ingenioſæ picturæ, quamvis ſatis per ſe loquaci, pium illud *Bernardini* Apophthegma, PROVOCARE OPORTET A TRIBUNALI JUSTITIÆ DIVINÆ AD TRIBUNAL MISERICORDIÆ VIRGINIS MARIÆ, tanquam Epigraphe ſeu pro Lemmate majuſculis & deauratis literis non adſcribitur. Nihil enim magìs appoſitè ad mentem hujus Tabellæ exprimendam aut pingi aut fingi poteſt. Vel potiùs ut de re tam ſeria ſeriò loquar (nam hæ *nugæ ad ſeria ducunt*) dolendum reverà eſt, quòd his & aliis hujuſmodi *piis* imò impiis *fraudibus* cor hominum Chriſtianorum (quod Deus ut peculium ſuum ſibi vendicat *Pro.* 23. 26.) à *Deo* & *Chriſto* ſenſim ſine ſenſu alienatur; & omnis ferè devotio & cultus in *Eccleſia Rom.* à *Deo* ad *Sanctos*, à *Chriſto* ad *Mariam* transfertur. Adeò ut

quem-

quemadmodum *Athanaſius* olim dixit, mirari orbem tunc temporis *Chriſtianum* ſe factum eſſe *Arianum*, ſic hujus temporis orbis *Romanus* miratur, aut mirari poteſt ſe factum eſſe *Marianum*. Nam ut illi qui tunc ſe *Chriſtianos* appellabant, erant tamen *Ariani*; ſic hi qui nunc ſe *Catholicos*, hoc eſt, optimos, imò ſolos *Chriſtianos* eſſe jactitant, ſunt tamen reverà *Mariani*, potiùs quàm *Chriſtiani*.

Sed oblitus ſum me *EPISTOLAM* ſcribere, & te hominem eſſe occupatiſſimum; & prætereà harum ipſarum rerum non adeò rudem & imperitum, ut me vel alio quopiam Monitore indigeas. Volo itaque (*humaniſſime & eruditiſſime VLITI*) ut hæc qualiacunque ſic accipias, non tanquam eo animo ſcripta à me eſſent, ut te docerem aliquid quod adhuc neſcias; ſed ut meam ipſius ſententiam ſimul cum veteris Eccleſiæ praxi & judicio, in uno ex præcipuis inter nos & *Pontificios* controverſis capitibus, apud te exponerem, & doctiſſimæ tuæ cenſuræ ſubjicerem. Quod ſi prolixiùs quàm oportebat fecerim, Tu pro tuo Candore & hoc etiam cum cæteris hujus ſcripti erratis facile, uti ſpero, condonabis

Amico Tui obſervantiſſimo

Datum ex Collegio Auriaco Bredæ, Jul. 1. 1659.

Georgio. Morley.

EPISTOLA

Ad Virum Clariſſimum

D. *CORNELIUM TRIGLANDIUM*,

UNUM

Ex Paſtoribus *Hagienſibus*, & Principi *Auriaco* à Studiis.

CONSCRIPTA

A Viro Reverendo D. *Georgio Morley* S. T. P. cùm *Bredæ* in exilio ageret.

IN QUA

Agitur de Sereniſſimi Regis *CAROLI* II. erga Reformatam Religionem affectu; item de afflicto, qualis tunc erat, Regni *Britannici* Statu.

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA
ACTON COLLECTION
CAMBRIDGE

LONDINI,

Impenſis *Joannæ Brome*. 1683.

Eruditiſſimo, Clariſſimóque Viro, Fratríque ſuo admodum Reverendo, *CORNELIO TRIGLANDIO*, uni ex Paſtoribus *Hagienſibus*, & Sereniſſimo Principi *AURIACO* á ſtudiis, Salutem in Chriſto.

UNIVERSITY LIBRARY ACAD. COLLECTION 1903 CAMBRIDGE

Vir Clariſſime,

LIteras tuas *Hagæ-Comitis* nono *Maii* ad me datas, & *Bredam* miſſas, (unde tunc aberam) tardiùs quidem, quàm pro temporis quo ſcribebantur ratione, loco tamen maximè idoneo, *Bruxellis* ſcilicet, accepi: & ſtatim *Regem* adeundi & alloquendi opportunitatem nactus, literas illas tuas, & Obſervantiæ erga ipſum, & Humanitatis erga me, pleniſſimas, coram *Sereniſſima* ipſius *Majeſtate* recitavi; unde & gratum animi tui ſenſum pro nupera ipſius in te benevolentiæ per me ſignificatione intellexit, & optimum illud tuum de ipſius Majeſtate amplius adhuc benè merendi ſtudium, magna cum voluptate agnovit, & laudavit; juſsítque me, ut proximis meis ad te Literis, non meo tantùm, ſed ſuæ ipſius *Majeſtatis* nomine, gratias tibi agerem. Quod quidem libens, lubénſque facio.

Quid enim mihi gratius contingere potuiſſet, quàm ut de eodem Viro idem eſſet judicium *Domini* mei, ac meum? vel quid optatius, aut jucundius, quàm idem habere in mandatis, & in votis, & quod ſponte facturus eſſem, ex officio facere? Siquid igitur voluptatis ex nupero illo internuncio cœperis, æquum eſt ut veriori & uberiori jam fruaris & perfundaris lætitiâ; cùm idem à me (quod auribus meis ex

ipſo ipſius *Regis* ore hauſi) teſtimonium non confirmatum modò ſed & auctum habeas.

Quòd verò tu, pro verecundia tua, nullum in temetipſo ad conciliandam tibi *Regis* noſtri benevolentiam meritum agnoſcas, ſed illud maxima ex parte *Regis* ipſius bonitati, & aliqua etiam ex parte mihi & opellæ meæ, quam tibi præſtiti, tribuendum cenſeas; ego quidem ut *primum* ex his tribus, ſine tua & veritatis injuria, concedere non poſſum: ſic *ſecundum* abſit ut negarem; imò nec *tertium* omninò diffitebor. Nam indignus eſſem illâ, quâ *Rex* noſter omnes fideles ſuos *Subditos* dignatur gratiâ; ſi vel *Peregrinos* de illo benè meritos, ad eandem apud illum gratiam (quantum quidem in me eſſet) non promoverem. Et ex peregrinis illos præcipuè qui *Reformatæ Religionis* vinculo nobiſcum conjuncti ſunt, benè autem de *Rege* noſtro merentur, qui illum talem, qualis reverà eſt, nempè bonum, & pium, & *Orthodoxum Principem* eſſe exiſtiment; meliùs, qui quod ipſi ſentiunt, prædicando & aliis etiam idem ſentiendi authores ſunt. Optimè verò & de *Rege*, & de *Eccleſia*, & de univerſa *Gente* noſtra, merentur illi, qui famam, & exiſtimationem innocentiſſimi & afflictiſſimi *Principis*, contra ſiniſtros & falſos de illo, in re *Religionis*, rumores (à quibuſdam ex *noſtris*, qui *Regem* aut non nôrunt, aut odio habent, de induſtria ſparſos, à nonnullis verò ex *veſtris* nimiùm patulis auribus credulíſque animis exceptos) ſartam tectam tuentur, vel ſaltem tueri conantur. Quod *Te* imprimis (pro illa qua meritò apud tuos vales gratia) & jam feciſſe audivit, & porrò (quoties occaſio dabitur) facturum eſſe *Rex* non dubitat.

Intereà mirari ſatis equidem non poſſum, non quòd hujuſmodi rumores ſpargantur; (nam ut olim fuerunt, ſic & nunc ſunt, & ſemper erunt κυβέρνησιν καταφρονοῦντες, καὶ δόξας βλασφημοῦντες) ſed eſſe aliquem ſanæ mentis, qui talibus calumniis (quæ nihil non dicam veritatis, ſed nec veriſimilitudinis quidem in ſe habent) aut *velit* aut *poſſit* fidem adhibere. Nam quibus quæſo indiciis conſtare, quibus argumentis apud æquos rerum æſtimatores probari poteſt, *Regem* noſtrum à *Paterna* & *Avita* (i.e.) ab optimè *Reformata Religi-*

Religione ad *Romanam* deſciviſſe? aut ulla ex parte, animi ſui ſententiam mutâſſe? Nôſti illud Poetæ;

Quo ſemel eſt imbuta recens, ſervabit odorem.
Teſta diu. ———

Et nemo, opinor, inficias ibit *Regem* noſtrum ab ipſis incunabulis in *Orthodoxa* & verè *Evangelica* doctrina imbutum, & enutritum fuiſſe. Nam ſi quis ſecùs dixerit aut ſenſerit, neceſſe eſt, ut alterum ex his duobus exiſtimet, etiam & affirmet: nempè vel *Eccleſiam* tunc temporis *Anglicanam* non fuiſſe *Orthodoxam*, (quod nemo ex *Reformatis*, qui ſuam ipſius *Eccleſiam* damnare nolit, affirmare poteſt) vel ſanctiſſimum & prudentiſſimum Principem (*Carolum* I. τὸν μακαρίτην intelligo) in alienis ſacris, & diversâ, ab *Eccleſia Anglicana*, fide (quam ipſe non dictis modo, & factis, & ſcriptis, dum viveret, celebravit; ſed ſanguine, & *Martyrio* ſuo moriens obſignavit) *Filium* ſuum dilectiſſimum, & Regnorum hæredem, de induſtria inſtituiſſe, & educâſſe: quod ut extremæ eſt impudentiæ dicere, ſic non minoris eſt dementiæ credere.

Sed annon fieri poteſt (inquient iſti ſuſurrones *Diabolici*) ut quis à recto, quo priùs inceſſerat, tramite deviet & deflectat? Fieri quidem poteſt: ſed multa quæ fieri poſſunt non fiunt tamen; & palam eſt *Regem* noſtrum eâdem quâ ſemper inceſſerit viâ adhuc inſiſtere, & iiſdem, quibus primùm initiatus eſt, ſacris adhuc operam dare. Nam bis *ſingulis diebus* divini cultûs Officia, *Matutinæ* ſcilicet & *Veſpertinæ preces* (quibus ipſe intereſſe ſolet) in *Aula* ejus publicè & ſtatis horis celebrantur; & *ſingulis Septimanis* Die Dominicâ *Conciones* item publicæ coram ipſo habentur: *ſingulis* denique *menſibus*, poſt preces & conciones, ſacra *Synaxis* adhibetur. Et hæc omnia abſque ulla *Pontificiæ Superſtitionis* mixtura, ſecundum formulam ab *Eccleſia Anglicana* inſtitutam, & uſurpatam, typiſque (ut omnibus innoteſcere poteſt) editam, peraguntur.

Quòd ſi quis adeò vecors ſit, ut hæc omnia per ſimulationem fieri dicat, næ illum non charitatis modò, quæ *Chriſtianum*, ſed candoris, addo etiam rationis, quæ *Hominem* decet, expertem eſſe oportet. Nam quid à *Chriſtiana charitate* (quæ dubia etiam & ambigua in meliorem partem interpretatur) magìs alienum eſſe poteſt, quàm de aliorum conſcientiis, non ſecundum ipſorum dicta aut facta, ſed juxta propriam, aut temerariam, aut malignam, de illis ſuſpicionem judicare? aut quid *Homine* non dicam *Chriſtiano*, ſed *ingenuo* magìs eſt indignum, quàm quæ dextra ſunt ſiniſtra accipere, & quæ benè fiunt, tanquam non bono, ſed malo animo facta eſſent, arguere? denique quid magìs ἄτοπον aut rectæ rationi minùs conſentaneum, quàm abſque omni ratione, imò contra omnem rationem, de alieni cujuſlibet (nè dicam *Principis*) mentis ſenſu & propoſito in præjudicium ejus pronunciare?

Et quænam quæſo vel fingi poteſt ratio aut ſpecies rationis, cur *Rex* noſter ſe *Evangelicum*, ſi non eſt, ſimularet eſſe? præſertim hoc tempore, & in illo, ubi nunc eſt, loco? Certè ſi non eſſet *Carolus Caroli* (qui mori, quàm abnegare vel diſſimulare religionem ſuam maluit) ſed *Carolus Ludovici* (qui nullam aliam præter diſſimulandi artem, tanquam Principi neceſſariam, filio ſuo commendavit) poterat fortaſſe ſimulare ſe *Pontificium* inter *Pontificios*, ut eo nomine gratior illis eſſet, ut illos benevolos magìs & beneficos, adeóque ad opitulandum ipſi promptiores & alacriores redderet: Jam verò cùm omnibus ſatìs conſtet, ex omnibus Pontificiis *Hiſpanos* imprimis καὶ ἐκφερεσθαι τῆ παλαιᾶ παραδόσει ζηλοῦντας eſſe, & proinde ab illis, quos vocant *Hæreticos*, maximè abhorrere; profectò non magìs impium quàm ſtolidum & inſanum eſſet, aliquem apud illos exulantem, & illorum auxilio maximè indigentem, apertè & publicè cum *Paulo* profiteri, ſe ſecundum illam, quam illi *Hæreſin* appellant, viam Deum colere, ſi eandem cum *Paulo* religionem mente ac animo non amplecteretur.

Quòd ſi adhuc inſtent malevoli & maledici, urgéantque perſonatæ tantùm & non ſinceræ religionis in *Rege* noſtro argu-

argumentum eſſe; quòd primò *Pariſiis* apud *Gallos*, deinde *Coloniæ* apud *Germanos*, poſtremò *Brugis* & *Bruxellis* apud *Hiſpanos*, ſemper autem & ubique (poſt nonnullam *Hagæ-Comitis* apud *Belgas* commorationem) inter *Pontificios* in Exilio ſuo vixerit. Reſpondeo eadem ratione probari poſſe *Davidem*, quoniam aliquandiù inter *Philiſtæos* commorabatur, non ampliùs *Iſraelitem* ſed *Philiſtæum* fuiſſe. Sin regerent hoc reverà feciſſe *Davidem*, ſed invitum, cùm à *Saulo* nimirum pulſus & proſcriptus eſſet, & cùm nulla ex duodecim Tribubus, (quæ eundem cum illo Deum eodem modo colerent) hoſpitio illum excipere aut vellet, aut auderet; idem à nobis pro *Carolo* noſtro dictum eſſe exiſtiment. Nam & ille à natali ſolo, non ſubditus à Rege, ſed *Rex* à ſubditis ſuis per vim expulſus, & Regnis (divino & hæreditario jure ſibi debitis) per ſummam injuriam excluſus, & à nullo *Proteſtantium Principum* aut *Ordinum*, vel invitatus vel admiſſus; ad illud, quod unicum patebat, refugium neceſſariò ſe recepit: quod fortaſſe aliis vitio verti poteſt, ſed non illi.

Nam ſi illi Deus optionem dediſſet, nemini dubium eſſe poteſt, quin & Hoſpitium cum aliis exilii ſolatiis, dum à Patria abeſſet, & reductionem in Patriam, & ad Paternum, cui natus eſt, Regnum reſtitutionem, illis potiùs qui ſunt ejuſdem cum illo, quàm qui ſunt diverſæ ab illo in *Religione Profeſſionis*, debere maluiſſet: itémque ex omnibus, qui eandem cum illo fidei & cultûs normam profitentur, veſtros potiſſimum *Ordines* elegiſſet, quorum Conſilio & Patrocinio ſe ſuáſque res omnes crederet, & commendaret.

Noverat enim quàm antiqua & arcta inter Regiam *Angliæ* familiam & *Rempublicam* veſtram, ab ipſa ejus Origine, interceſſerat amicitia, nobis quidem non inutilis, ſed vobis (ut tunc ſe res veſtræ habuerunt) prorſus neceſſaria. Quam quidem amicitiam, in afflictiſſima conditione veſtra, non ſine multa cùm pecuniæ tum ſanguinis *Anglicani* profuſione, ab *Elizabetha* inchoatam; deinde ab Avo Regis noſtri *Jacobo*, cum maximis in *Rempublicam* & *Eccleſiam* veſtram meritis, auctam & confirmatam; poſtremò à *Carolo* Patre ſanctiſſimè cultam, & nuptiis Filiæ ſuæ (ut credi par erat) inviolabiliter

violabiliter ſancitam & ſtabilitam; adeóque à Majoribus ſuis longa ſerie ad ſe devolutam, & quaſi propagatam *Carolus* Filius ſibi nunquam defuturam eſſe credidit. Præſertim cum ſanioribus (etiam inter vos) *Politicis*, non minùs ex re veſtra quàm noſtra eſſe videatur, nè optimè merita de vobis omnibus *Familia* nefariis Proditorum & Parricidarum machinationibus prorſus opprimeretur.

Nam ſi vobis mercaturam exercentibus, *Anglicæ* Gentis Amicitia, propter Piſcationem & Portuum opportunitatem, ſit (ut reverà eſt) omninò neceſſaria: non minùs neceſſarium erit, ut *Anglia* talem Regiminis formam habeat, cui vobiſcum pacem colere, quàm bellum gerere magìs expediat. Et prætereà, ut in iſto regimine ad clavum ſedeat, cum quo vobis certum & conſtans fœdus inire liceat, & à quo, Majorum ſuorum exemplis edocto, & veſtris erga ipſum meritis obſtricto, nihil eſt (quod ſperare fas eſt) quod facillimè impetrare non poteſtis.

Primum igitur, quod ante omnia cavere debetis, eſt, nè alia quàm *Monarchica* Politiæ ſpecies in *Anglia* obtineat: *Secundum*, nè quem alium regnare patiamini, quàm cui ſceptrum jure indubitatæ ſucceſſionis, & Patriis legibus ac inſtitutis, manifeſtiſſimè debetur: nam quòd *ſpuria vitulamina*, hoc eſt, adulterinæ & illegitimæ Plantationes, ſive in Familiis, ſive in Regnis, altas & duraturas radices non agent, *Cromwellianæ* Domûs fortuna, ſeu potiùs juſtiſſima Dei in illum vindicta, nunc oſtendit; itémque quòd *Fœdera* cum talibus inita arenoſo fundamento meritò ſunt innixa, & nonnunquam eidem cum Confœderatis maledictioni divinæ obnoxia; quod nè vobis, *Ordinibúſ*que veſtris contingat, Deum obſecro.

Non poteſtis tamen, opinor, non vereri, nè multiceps illa *Hydra*, quæ ex μονοκεφάλη nupera tyrannide nunc pullulare incipit, in perniciem veſtram æquè ac noſtram brevi excreſcat; præſertim ſi in *Reipublicæ* formam, quò tendere videtur, coaleſcat. Nam duabus tam vicinis, & eandem *Amaſiam* (mercaturam ſcilicet) ambientibus *Rebuspublicis* nunquam inter ſe conveniet: neque ullus bellandi inter Vos finis

finis erit, donec vel vos illos, vel illi vos, non ad inopiam modò, ſed ad ſervitutem redegerint.

Et illi quidem quomodò erga vos animati ſunt, & quàm hoſtili odio in vos etiam nunc flagrant, non diſſimulant. Nam in prima (poſt occupatum imperium) quam pro rebus à ſe geſtis & gerendis nuperrimè ediderunt, *Apologia*, (quam egomet ipſe vidi ac legi, typis, ut omnibus innoteſceret, impreſſam) diſertis verbis *Cromwellum* Patrem acriter ac acerbè perſtringunt, cùm propter alia tum ob duo potiſſimum, magna cum gentis *Anglicanæ* injuria ac infamia (ut illi aiunt) ab illo facta; nempè injuſtiſſimum Bellum *Hiſpanis* illatum, & damnoſiſſimam Pacem *Vobiſcum* pactam. Ex quo quid (rebus domi conſtitutis) facturi ſint, non opus eſt *Oedipo* ut quis intelligat.

Quòd ſi ad veterem (per ſe nimis potentem) novus non minus formidabilis accedat hoſtis, & terrâ marique ſimul, hoc eſt, undique & ubique oppugnamini, cogitate quæſo, quibus amicitiis fulti, aut fœderibus freti, ad tantam belli molem vel amovendam vel ſuſtinendam pares eſſe poſſitis. Una quidem eſt (& fortaſſe unica) certè optima, expeditiſſima & veriſſima, addam etiam & honeſtiſſima & minimè ſumptuoſa, vos ex omnibus quæ hinc, vel indè, vel alicundè impendent, vel impendere poſſunt, periculis extricandi ratio; nempè ſi quod olim fieri oportuit illud vel nunc facere in animum inducatis, *Regem* ſcilicet noſtrum & illos, qui ejus ſequuntur & ſecuturi ſunt partes, in Patrocinium veſtrum recipere; & bellum (quod utcunque vel nolentes habituri eſtis) occupare potiùs quàm expectare.

Sed *Martis* aleam, inquies, infeliciter cum Gente veſtra non ita pridem experti ſumus, & pacem quamvis non ſatis æquam omni bello anteferendam ducimus. Certè, ſi penes vos eſſet vel pacem, vel bellum pro arbitrio eligere; ſed Bellum (ut dixi) vel duriſſimum ſervitutis jugum vobis vel invitiſſimis eſt ſubeundum; ſervire autem cùm liberam & fortiſſimam gentem non deceat, reſtat ut apud vos pro prudentia veſtra ſtatuatis, bellum forenſe vel domeſticum, breve vel diuturnum, utile vel damnoſum, victoriam denique faci-

lem & certam, vel difficilem & incertam habiturum, eligere ſatius eſſe exiſtimetis. Neque ex anteacto bello ſolis auſpiciis veſtris geſto, de futuro, (quod aſſumpto in ſocietatem *Rege* noſtro gerendum ſuadeo) conjectandum eſt.

Multùm, mihi credite, ad debellandum illum hoſtem, in ſolo *Regis* nomine, ponderis eſt & momenti. Nam quamvis hactenus ut Cyphra per ſe poſita nihil valuiſſe videatur; vobis tamen additus & adjunctus vires veſtras non augebit modò, ſed multiplicabit, & omninò inſuperabiles efficiet: adeò ut ſi bellum inferentibus, vel propulſantibus, Confœderato & Commilitone aliquo opus fuerit (ut certè erit) nemo ſit ex omnibus totius Orbis vel potentiſſimis Principibus, qui *Rege* noſtro quantumvis nudo & inermi, non dicam magìs fidelem, ſed nec magìs efficacem ad victoriam de illo hoſte reportandam, aut velit, aut poſſit operam vobis præſtare. Nam cæteri *Principes* veſtrum quidem numerum, vel navium vel militum, poſſunt augere; ſed hoſtium veſtrorum nec multitudinem nec vires poſſunt minuere. Et talis eſt ille Hoſtis, ut niſi dividatur, vix, ac nè vix vinci poſſit.

Prætereà ut *Antæus* terrâ, ſic *Angli* mari vel ab ipſo *Hercule* ſunt inſuperabiles. Navali itaque prælio (ſi evitari poſſit) non eſt cum illis conſligendum, ſed cum lecta militum manu (quibus *Regem* noſtrum aut præeſſe, aut ſaltem intereſſe oportet) ſubitò transfretandum. Et quocunque hoc fiat loco (quamplurimis autem in locis poteſt fieri) non dubitandum eſt (quamprimùm de *Regis* adventu, & de veſtra cum illo conjunctione, *Subditis* ſuis conſtiterit) quin, illa manus militum, quantumvis exigua in principio fuerit, in numeroſiſſimum *Exercitum* ſtatim excreſcat, advolantibus nimirùm hinc indè ad Caſtra *Regis* viciniores Provincias incolentibus, & mox omnibus ubique locorum Regni ad vindicandam corporum, bonorum & animarum libertatem certatim, & catervatim concurrentibus.

Nam variatâ toties Tyrannide, & nunquam emendatâ ſed in deterius ſemper mutatâ illorum conditione, jam tandem intelligunt, nuſquam veriorem vel tutiorem, quàm ſub bonis

bonis & legitimis Regibus, libertatem eſſe; neque ullum malorum ſuorum aut finem aut modum expectandum, donec, *quæ Dei ſunt Deo*, & *quæ Cæſaris ſunt Cæſari*, reſtitutis, omnia ad priſtinam & optimam tam in Sacris, quàm in Civilibus, vivendi normam reducantur. Nam, ut nunc res ſunt, nullus eſt omninò *Dei cultus*, nulla *Legum* reverentia, nulla *Majeſtas publica*, nulla *ſalus* aut *ſecuritas privata*; ſed omnia ſuſque deque habentur, dum pauci ex fæce Plebis *Sectarii*, Sicariis & Gladiatoribus ſtipati, quicquid libet, hoc eſt quicquid fieri non oportet, faciunt: & hanc *Oligarchiam* ϛρατιωτικὴν (quæ eſt Tyrannidis ſpecies omnium peſſima) *Rempublicam* appellant. Adeò *Anglia* noſtra, quæ non ita pridem erat, & adhuc, ſi bona ſua noſſet, eſſe poterat, omnium Gentium liberrima & feliciſſima, nunc mancipiorum mancipium facta ſub non minus pudendo quàm gravi ſervitutis jugo gemit.

Quare non dubitandum eſt quin ad primam emancipationis oblatam ſpem omnes communi conſenſu ſeſe erecturi ſint, & quamlibet tam turpe jugum excutiendi anſam avidè arrepturi; adeò ut breviſſimo tempore, modicis ſumptibus, & nullo ferè cum periculo, res poſſit confici; aut ſi quid periculi ſiet, noſtrum erit & non veſtrum. Nam quamvis nos ſanguine noſtro libertatem veſtram redemerimus; ad noſtram tamen recuperandam paululum tantummodò pecuniæ, paucas naves, & aliquid inſuper armorum & commeatûs bellici, pro uſura ſanguinis noſtri poſtulamus. Et ſperamus Vos tandem eſſecturos, nè Nos *Officio certâſſe priori* pœniteat, & nè ſanguinem noſtrum, quem gratis profudimus, etiam pro ingratis profudiſſe videamur.

Certè nulli unquam Genti magis optanda, quàm nunc veſtræ, oblata eſt aut eſſe poteſt occaſio, unâ eadémque operâ & gratiam bene merentibus referendi, & ſuam ipſius ſalutem cum lucro & gloria procurandi. Nam primò quid ad ſalutem, imò vitam (ut ita dicam) *Reipublicæ* veſtræ tuendam & conſervandam, magis eſt neceſſarium quàm *Angliam* tam vicinam, tam mari terráque potentem gentem non modò non habere inimicam, ſed habere ſemper conſiliorum & pericu-

riculorum ſociam, contráque quoſlibet hoſtes promptiſſimum & fideliſſimum *Hyperaſpiſten?* Deinde quid utilius aut ad mercaturam (hoc eſt ad *Reipub.* veſtræ animam) fovendam, ſtabiliendam & amplificandam efficacius, quàm Navigationem per omnia *Britannicæ* ditionis maria habere ſecuram, piſcationem in *Scotia* liberam, & omnes in *Anglia*, *Scotia* & *Hibernia* portus navibus veſtris recipiendis, & recreandis, itémque mercibus importandis & exportandis paratos & patentes? Poſtremò quid magìs glorioſum, & omni laude magìs dignum, quàm *Regem* optimum & optimè erga vos affectum, Auguſtiſſimis natalibus ortum, & ampliſſimis regnis, divino humanóque jure, deſtinatum, nunc verò nullo ſuo merito exhæredatum & exulantem, in patriam reducere & in paterno ſolio collocare? nec non *Regnum* nuper Florentiſſimum, nunc verò à Parricidis & Prædonibus occupatum & oppreſſum, in libertatem aſſerere? *Eccleſiam* denique *reformatam*, & paucis abhinc annis (abſit invidia dicto) ex omnibus reformatis formoſiſſimam, nunc verò portentoſis *Hæreticorum* opinionibus deformatam, multiplicibus *Sectariorum* ſchiſmatibus laceratam, & horrendis *Atheorum* Sacrilegiis tantùm non perditam, priſtinæ ſuæ *Orthodoxiæ* pulchritudini, & patrimonio reſtituere? Hæc autem omnia nobis tam utilia, vobíſque tam glorioſa, faciliùs à veſtra *Repub.* quàm à quolibet alio *Principe*, præſtari poſſunt. Et reverà omnes, qui domi aut foris ſumus, *Angli*, hoc tantum beneficium vobis potiùs, quàm ullis mortalium, (præterquam nobiſmet ipſis) debere malumus.

Quòd ſi hanc tam opportunam de nobis, de vobiſmet ipſis, & de divino numine, benè merendi occaſionem (ut hactenus omniſiſtis) omittere porrò pergátis, *aliunde fortaſſe*, (ut dixit *Mardochæus Eſtheræ*) *nobis erit liberatio.* Non addam quod ſequitur in Textu, *vos autem peribitis:* ſed ſi liberè quod ſentio loqui liceat, quicquid de nobis fiet; aut multi qui vobis non malè volunt mecum falluntur, aut vos hujus Conſilii veſtri ſerò & fruſtrà pœnitebit. Sed meliora de vobis, & à vobis ſperamus: & Deum *Patrem Luminum* indeſi-

indeſinenter oramus, & orabimus, ut det vobis mentem *intelligere*, animúmque *velle* illa quæ ad Pacem veſtram æquè ac noſtram reverà pertinent.

Sed quarè aut quorſùm, inquies, *Ego* ad *Te*, *Theologus* ad *Theologum*, hæc ſcribo, quæ ſunt *Politicorum* propria? aut ſi mihimet ineptire libeat, cur tibi tantum otii à re tua eſſe crederem, aliena ut cures? Rectè quidem, ſi eſſent *aliena:* ſed cùm homines ſimus, *humani nihil alienum* à nobis eſſe putare debemus, & multò minùs quæ ad *Chriſtianos* ſpectant aliena eſſe à *Chriſtianis:* præſertim, ſi concivium noſtrorum res agitur, quibuſcum neceſſe eſt etiam noſmetipſos aut ſalvos eſſe, aut naufragium facere. Quare dabis mihi veniam uti ſpero (*Vir Clariſſime*) ſi (pro Officio *Regi* & Obſequio *Tibi* debito) ad Te ſcripturus non potuerim mihi temperare, quin ex abundantia cordis eloquerer, & quæ ſæpiùs mecum cogitare ſoleo, apud te effutirem.

Sed ſcias intereà velim, me hoc non juſſu *Regis*, ſed ſponte mea facere; ut ſi quid liberius aut imprudentius dixerim, mihi ſoli & in ſolidum imputetur. Spero tamen me tali temperamento uſum fuiſſe, ut nec amore nimio in Patriam, nec perverſo partium ſtudio abreptus eſſe videar. Certè ſi quis *Belgas* non *Belga* amat, eíſque ex animo benè optat, *Ego* is ſum: & meritò quidem, utpote inter quos majorem decennii partem ſic vixi, ut etiam inter illos, quàm in ulla alia Orbis terrarum Regione (ſi in patria non liceat) mori mallem. Quare non poſſum non optare, non poſſum non ſuadere, imò non poſſum non ſperare arctiſſimam & indiſſolubilem inter gentem veſtram & noſtram Unionem. Per *Gentem* autem *noſtram* intelligo non *factionem* aliquam ab hoc vel illo *Demagogo* ex viſceribus Plebis ſubitò exhalatam & (poſt brevem coruſcationem) non minùs ſubitò labentem vel lapſuram. Nam cum talibus fœdere ſociari quid aliud eſt quàm nubem pro *Junone* amplecti? ſed verum & integrum *corpus Politicum* vero & genuino

nuino *Capiti* ſuo adunatum, cujus falsâ ſpecie & umbrâ nimium diu eſt quòd hactenus decepti eſtis. Faxit igitur *Reſpublica* veſtra, ut huic *Capiti* hoc *Corpus* iterum adhæreſcat, ut vos cum utroque firmiùs & intimiùs, quàm unquam antehac, coaleſcatis.

Intra pauciſſimos annos, multas vidiſtis in Orbe *Britannico* mutationes: ſed omnium peſſima, præſertim ut vos reſpicit, eſt noviſſima. Cavete igitur, nè ſit ultima. Uno & altero *Phaethonte* jam excuſſo, multiplicatis Aurigis, intenditur potiùs quàm remittitur conflagratio, veſtram etiam Domum, ni maturè proſpiciatis, propediem correptura. Proſpicere autem huic periculo non poteſtis; niſi *Phœbus* noſter, à vobis adjutus, currum ſuum ocyùs aſcenderit, & benigniori aſpectu, quàm Cometarum aliquis aut velit aut poſſit, nobis vobíſque illuxerit. Hæc verò adeò ſunt per ſe clara, ut nemo ſit qui non videat.

Quare ut omnia quæ jam dixi, & quæ (à me ſaltem) hac de re dici poſſunt, ſummatim complectar & unicâ Periodo abſolvam. Nihil profectò eſt quod noſtrâ vel *Regis* noſtri gratiâ, à vobis fieri flagitamus, quod nobis non petentibus, & nulla ad Nos aut *Regem* noſtrum ratione habitâ, à vobis ultro fieri, & quàm maturè fieri non oporteat, ſi voſmetipſos ſalvos eſſe velitis. Et tamen quicquid à vobis vel ita fiet, non recuſamus, quin illud totum, quaſi noſtri ſolius gratiâ factum eſſet, vobis omninò imputetur; & nos ſic illud accepturos, ut debitores pro tanto & tam opportuno beneficio deceat, ſanctiſſimè pollicemur.

Quæ verò nunc ad Te ſcripſi, *Vir Clariſſime*, ſi ponderatis rationum momentis, Tu adjecto tui limatioris judicii calculo comprobaveris, per me licebit, ſi tibi libet, quibuſvis amicorum tuorum, eadem mecum & tecum ſentientibus & optantibus communicare. Sin quæ à me in medium allata ſunt vel inepta vel infirma, vel non opportuna pro rerum & temporis ratione eſſe cenſueris; penes te eſſe volo vel ſilentio premere, vel *Vulcano* devovere, vel quicquid tibi placuerit, ac ſi tui ipſius eſſent, de illis ſtatuere.

Supereſt

Supereſt ut prolixitatem hujus Scripti (quâ vereor nè quam reſcribendi moram plus quàm compenſaverim) excuſarem. Sed hoc & quicquid aliud à me erratum fuerit, tu pro candore tuo (*Vir humaniſſime & Eruditiſſime*) condonabis illi, qui & veſtræ gentis eſt amantiſſimus &

Tuæ ipſius Reverentiæ

Obſervantiſſimus, tuæque

Amicitiæ ſtudioſiſſimus.

Datum ex Collegio Auriaco Bredæ, Jun. 7. 1659.

Georgius Morley.

A

POSTSCRIPT.

THey that have put themſelves to the trouble of reading all, or any of theſe *Papers*, are deſired before They give their Cenſures of them, to reflect upon the Cauſe and End, for which They were publiſhed, (as they are ſpecified in the *Preface* to them) which was not a vain oſtentation of what I had ſaid, or could ſay, upon any of thoſe Subjects that are handled; or becauſe I thought the learned part of the World would be the wiſer for them; but merely for the Vindicating of my ſelf from the ſuſpicion of being a *Papiſt*, or having been any way a Perverter of the late *Dutcheſs* of *YORK* (if She were perverted) in Her Religion, as *Maimbourg* the *Jeſuite*'s Text, with *Elymas* the *Sorcerer*'s Comment upon it, would make the World believe me to have been. This (I ſay) being the onely Cauſe and End of publiſhing theſe *Papers* (which otherwiſe ſhould never have been

publiſhed, whilſt I lived at leaſt) if they prove effectual to that End, it is all I deſire of them, or expect from them.

One thing more, which I would deſire the *Readers* to take notice of, is, that I did not hear that the Authour of the Pamphlet, called *Elymas the Sorcerer*, was dead, till after I had ſent theſe Papers together with the *Preface* before them to the Preſs. And therefore, whereas I ſay in that Preface, *I would call him to an account for it*; my meaning was to Indict him for an *Action of Slander* at the *King*'s *Bench-Bar*, as I did once before upon Words ſpoken by him to the ſame ſcandalous intent and purpoſe, and atteſted upon Oath by the Biſhop of *Bangor* his Dioceſan, and by two of his *Chaplains*; Whereupon he was fined 300 *l.* and a Living he had in *Wales* ſequeſtred for the payment of it; Which Fine (as he himſelf confeſſeth in this very Pamphlet) I offred him to remit wholly, if he would confeſs he had ſpoken thoſe Words, which were ſworn againſt Him, and ask me forgiveneſs for them; which when he would not, 'tis true, his Living was ſequeſtred; but I reſolved to be not a Peny the better for it, nor was not; but of the Money that was levied and received by me, I ſent him 20 *l.* ſome was given by me to the repairing of the Cathedral of *Bangor*, and the reſt

reſt to other pious Uſes there in that Country. And as I did not then, ſo I did not intend now by bringing ſuch an *Action* againſt him to get any thing by it my ſelf, or to put him to any Charge, but onely to Shame for it, by having this *Book* of his condemned to be burnt as a moſt falſe, groundleſs, and injurious *Libell*; and which I know not why it may not without breach of Charity be done yet; for though *Actio contra Perſonam moritur cum perſona*, yet *contra Libellum famoſum & ad vindicandum innocentem à calumnia*, I know not why it may not be continued. In the mean time, as *Actio moritur cum Perſona, in foro Soli*; ſo I hope before he dyed, he did ſo truly and heartily repent of that, and all other his Sins, that he may never be called to account for them in *foro Poli* neither.

FINIS.